

A HEBREW-GREEK INDEX TO *8HevXIIgr*

THE following Hebrew-Greek index to the Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Naḥal Ḥever (*8HevXIIgr*) was compiled on the basis of its edition in the *Discoveries of the Judean Desert* series, by E. Tov with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft (reprint with corrections, 1995). (1) Due reference was also made to *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, D. Barthélemy's older edition and seminal study of this intriguing manuscript. (2)

The present index intends to supplement the index of Greek words contained in the DJD volume, by linking each entry to its Hebrew counterpart in MT (or, occasionally, the assumed *Vorlage* of *8HevXIIgr*) for ease of reference and enhanced two-way searchability. The list indexes all completely or partly preserved lexical items in the manuscript, according to the reconstructions of the editor. This includes a single previously unidentified fragment (PAM 40.559), identified as *Za* 4,8-10 by E. Puech. (3)

(*) The authors are working with professors Hans Ausloos and Bénédicte Lemmelijn at the *Centre for Septuagint Studies and Textual Criticism* (Faculty of Theology, K.U.Leuven) and collaborate in two research projects funded by the K.U.Leuven and the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO): *Once-only Hebrew and Uniquely Greek. The Greek Rendering of Hebrew Hapax Legomena as a Significant Indication within the Characterisation of the Septuagint Translation and Canticles in Hebrew and Greek. A Comparative Analysis of the Translation Technique of the Septuagint and the So-Called Pre-Hexaplaric Revisions*.

(1) *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll from Nahal Hever (8HevXIIgr) (The Seiyāl Collection 1)* (ed. Tov, with the collaboration of R.A. Kraft and a contribution by P.J. Parsons; DJD 8; Oxford: Clarendon, ²1995); first edition Oxford: Clarendon, 1990.

(2) D. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila. Première publication intégrale du texte des fragments du Dodécaprophète trouvés dans le désert de Juda, précédée d'une étude sur les traductions et recensions grecques de la Bible réalisées au premier siècle de notre ère sous l'influence du rabbinat palestinien* (SVT 10; Leiden: Brill, 1963). See also idem, "Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant de l'histoire de la Septante," *RB* 60 (1953) 18-29.

(3) E. Puech, "Les fragments non identifiés de 8KhXIIgr et le manuscrit grec

For each Hebrew entry, the index lists all Greek equivalents in *8HevXIIgr* and their occurrences, both by biblical verse and according to column and line of the scroll itself (between brackets). If applicable, verbal roots are subdivided into the various stems occurring in the manuscript. The following symbols are used throughout the index:

- † indicates that a given occurrence of the lexeme is partly reconstructed; if there is any doubt concerning the reconstruction, this is indicated in a footnote;
- ^{#LXX} indicates that the lexeme in *8HevXIIgr* differs from the one in Ziegler's edition of LXX Minor Prophets; (4) differences in accident and declension are not noted in this way;
- ^{#MT} indicates that the presumed *Vorlage* of *8HevXIIgr* differs lexically from MT; differences in accident and declension are not noted in this way; the corresponding reading of MT is normally recorded between brackets.

A few entries, viz. the article, various pronouns and pronominal suffixes, and the few pluses in *8HevXIIgr* with respect to MT, have been grouped at the end.

This index may be useful for a number of purposes, including the study of the translation technique of *8HevXIIgr*, comparative studies of lexical patterning involving *8HevXIIgr*, (5) comparative study of Greek and/or Hebrew quotations from the Minor Prophets (6), and research into *καίγε*-Theodotion and the Greek Minor Versions in general.

אב πατήρ Za 1,4[†] (XXVIII,40)

אבד *qal* ἀπόλλυμι Jo 3,9[†] (III,31); Mi 4,9[†] (VIII,12)

אבן λίθος Ha 2,19 (XVIII,36)

אדיר δυναστής Na 2,6^{#LXX} (XIV,1)

אדם ἄνθρωπος Jo 3,7[†] (III,23); Mi 5,4(5)[†] (IX,4); Ha 2,17[†] (XVIII,27); Zp 1,3[†] (XX,27); Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,36); Za 9,1[†] (B2,5)

אדמה γῆ Zp 1,2[†] (XX,27); Zp 1,3 (XX,32)

אדר → אדרת

des douze petits prophètes,” *RB* 98 (1991): 161-169. See also idem, “Notes en marge de 8KhXIIgr,” *RevQ* 15 (1991-1992): 583-593.

(4) *Duodecim prophetae*. Edidit J. Ziegler (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1943).

(5) E.g. P.J. Gentry, *The Asterisked Materials in the Greek Job* (SBL SCS 38; Atlanta, GA: SBL, 1995). See also the work done by Gentry's students: K.J. Youngblood, *Translation Technique in the Greek Lamentations* (Unpublished Dissertation: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2004); Y.Y. Yi, *Translation Technique of the Greek Ecclesiastes* (Unpublished Dissertation: Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, 2005).

(6) See for instance G.J. Brooke, “The Twelve Minor Prophets and the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Congress Volume Leiden 2004* (ed. A. Lemaire; SVT 109; Leiden – Boston: Brill, 2006), 19-43 (p. 29).

- אדרת περιβόλαιον Mi 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT אדר; VI,5)
 אהב *qal* ἀγαπάω Za 8,19[†] (B1,10)
 אחד εἷς Za 8,21 (B1,16)
 אחר ἕτερος Za 2,7(3)[†] (XXX,29)
 אחרים ὀπισθεν Zp 1,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,42)
 אים θάμβος Ha 1,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,29)
 אין οὐκ (οὐ μὴ) ἔστι Mi 4,4 (VII,38); Ha 2,19[†] (XVIII,39)
 איש ἀνὴρ Jo 3,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,28); Mi 4,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,36); Zp 3,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXIII,37)
 אכל *qal* ἐσθίω (ἔσθω) Na 3,12[†] (XV,25); Ha 1,8[†] (XVI,36); Ha 3,14[†] (XIX,42) | *hif'al* καταναλίσκω Za 9,4[†] (B2,16)
 אכן διὰ τοῦτο Zp 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXIII,41)
 אל μὴ Za 1,4 (XXVIII,39)
 אל ἐπὶ Mi 4,3[†] (VII,35) | πρὸς Jo 2,5[†] (II,39); Jo 3,2[†] (III,10); Jo 3,8[†] (III,27); Jo 4,2 (III,36); Za 1,3 (XXVIII,38); Za 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXVIII,40); Za 1,14 (XXIX,39); Za 2,8(4)[†] (XXX,31); Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,28); Za 8,21[†] ^{≠LXX} (B1,16)
 אלהים θεός Jo 3,8[†] (III,27); Jo 3,9[†] (III,30); Jo 3,10 (III,33); Mi 4,5[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,40); Mi 4,5 (VII,41); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,40); Na 1,14[†] (XIII,23); Za 8,23 (B2,2)
 אליל εἰδωλὸν Ha 2,18 (XVIII,34)
 אלם κωφός Ha 2,18 (XVIII,34)
 אלהי חילιάς Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,33)
 אם ἔάν Ha 2,3 (XVII,27)
 אמה ἄβρα Na 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,7)
 אמון ἀμὼν Zp 1,1[†] (XX,25)
 אמונה πίστις Ha 2,4 (XVII,30)
 אמן *hif'il* πιστεύω Jo 3,5[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,15)
 אמר *qal* λέγω Jo 2,5 (II,38); Jo 3,4[†] (III,14); Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,37); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,35); Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,38); Za 1,3 (XXVIII,38); Za 1,4 (XXVIII,41); Za 1,14[†] (XXIX,40); Za 2,12(8)[†] (XXX,41); Za 3,2 (XXXI,21); Za 3,4 (XXXI,28); Za 3,4 (XXXI,29); Za 3,7 (XXXI,38)
 אמת ἀλήθεια Za 8,19[†] (B1,9)
 אנחנו ἡμεῖς Mi 4,5 (VII,41)
 אני ἐγώ Jo 2,5[†] (II,38)
 אסף *qal* συνάγω Mi 4,6[†] (VIII,1); Ha 1,15[†] (XVII,12); Zp 1,2[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,26) | συναγωγή Zp 1,2[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,25) | *hif'il* προστίθημι Jo 2,5[†] (II,39)
 אף ὀργή Jo 3,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,31)
 אפלה σκοτία Ha 2,4[†] ^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT עפל *pu'al*; XVII,29); Zp 1,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXI,32)
 אפס πέρας Mi 5,3(4)[†] ^{≠LXX} (VIII,42)
 אפף *qal* περιχέω Jo 2,6[†] (II,39)
 אפרתה εφραθα Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,32)
 ארבה ἀκρίς Na 3,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,34)
 ארבעה τέσσαρες Za 2,3(1,20)[†] (XXX,16)
 ארבעים τεσσεράκοντα Jo 3,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,14)
 ארמון βάρις Mi 5,4(5)[†] (IX,2)
 ארץ γῆ Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,42); Mi 5,5(6)[†] ^{≠LXX} (IX,5); Mi 5,5(6) (IX,6); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,28); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,41); Ha 3,9 (XIX,27)

- אש πῦρ Na 3,13 (XV,28); Za 9,4 (B2,16)
 אשור ασσουρ Mi 5,4(5) (IX,1); Mi 5,5(6) (IX,5); Mi 5(6) (IX,7)
 אשר ὄς Jo 3,10 (III,34); Mi 1,1[†] (IV,29); Mi 4,6 (VIII,3); Za 1,4
 (XXVIII,40) | ὄσος Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,40)
 את ἄροτρον Mi 4,3 (VII,33)
 אתמול ἔμπροσθεν Mi 2,8[†] (VI,3)
 אתנן μίσθωμα Mi 1,7[†] (IV,44); Mi 1,7[†] (V,1); Mi 1,7[†] (V,2)
- ב- εἰς Jo 3,4 (III,13); Mi 5,4(5)[†] ^{≠LXX} (IX,1); Mi 5,5(6)^{≠LXX} (IX,7); Mi
 5,5(6)^{≠LXX} (IX,8); Na 2,14 (XV,30) | ἐν Jo 3,8 (III,29); Mi 1,1 (IV,28);
 Mi 1,2 (IV,32); Mi 4,7 (VIII,6); Mi 5,1(2) (VIII,33); Mi 5,1(2)
 (VIII,34); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,39); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,40); Mi 5,5(6) (IX,5);
 Mi 5,5(6) (IX,6); Na 2,6 (XIV,2); Na 2,14 (XIV,26); Na 3,8 (XV,12);
 Na 3,13[†] (XV,26); Ha 1,16 (XVII,16); Ha 2,1[†] (XVII,22); Ha 2,4^{≠LXX}
 (XVII,30); Ha 2,17^{≠LXX} (XVIII,29); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,39); Ha 2,20
 (XVIII,40); Ha 3,12 (XIX,33); Ha 3,14 (XIX,39); Zp 1,5^{≠LXX} (XX,41);
 Zp 1,18[†] (XXI,41); Za 9,1 (B2,3); Za 9,4 (B2,16) | ἐπὶ Mi 5,4(5) (IX,2)
 | → מסתר
- באר *pi'el* ἐκφαίνω Ha 2,2[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,24) (7)
 בגד ἱμάτιον Za 3,5 (XXXI,36)
 בהמה κτήνος Jo 3,8 (III,27)
 בוא *qal* δύ(ν)ω Mi 3,6[†] (VI,42) | ἔρχομαι Mi 4,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (VIII,9); Mi 5,4(5)^{≠LXX}
 (IX,1); Mi 5,5(6)^{≠LXX} (IX,7); Ha 2,3 (XVII,28); Za 8,20[†] ^{≠LXX} (B1,13) |
 ἦκω Ha 1,9 (XVI,36); Ha 2,3[†] (XVII,28) | πορεύομαι Jo 3,4[†] ^{≠LXX}
 (III,13)
- בזז *qal* διαρπάζω Na 2,10[†] (XIV,11); Na 2,10[†] (XIV,12)
 בחר *qal* ἐκλέγω Za 2,16(12)[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXXI,14)
 בטח *qal* πείθω Ha 2,18 (XVIII,32)
 בית οἶκος Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,32); Na 1,14 (XIII,23); Ha 3,13^{≠LXX} (XIX,36); Za
 3,7 (XXXI,41); Za 8,19[†] (B1,7)
- בכורים σκοπός Na 3,12[†] (XV,24)
 בלי (μὴ) ὑπάρχει Zp 3,6[†] (XXIII,36)
 בלע *qal* καταπίνω Jo 2,1[†] (II,30)
 בן υἱός Zp 1,1 (XX,25); Za 1,1[†] (XXVIII,33)
 בנה *qal* οἰκοδομέω Za 9,3[†] (B2,9)
 בעד κατὰ Jo 2,7^{≠LXX} (II,42)
 בעל βασιλ Zp 1,4 (XX,36)
 בער *hif'il* ἐκκαίω Na 2,14[†] (XIV,26)
 בצור ὄχυρός Zp 1,16[†] (XXI,34)
 בצע *pi'el* ἐπιτελέω Za 4,9[†] (PAM 40.559, 4)
 בקע *pi'el* ῥήγνυμι Ha 3,9 (XIX,26) | *hitpa'el* ῥήγνυμι Mi 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX}
 (IV,35)
 בקש *pi'el* ζητέω Na 3,7 (XV,10); Na 3,11[†] (XV,22)
 ברח *qal* φεύγω Jo 4,2[†] (III,38)

(7) On this reconstruction, see Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 92.

- בריא στερεός Ha 1,16^{≠LXX} (XVII,17)
 בריח μοχλός Jo 2,7[†] (II,42); Na 3,13[†] (XV,28)
 ברכה κολυμβήθρα Na 2,9[†] (XIV,9)
 ברק ἀστραπή Ha 3,11[†] (XIX,31) (8)
 בשר σάρξ Za 2,17(13) (XXXI,16)
 בת θυγάτηρ Mi 4,8 (VIII,8); Mi 4,10[†] (VIII,14); Za 2,11(7)[†] (XXX,40)
- גאון ἔπαρσις Mi 5,3(4)^{≠LXX} (VIII,40)
 גבה ὕψηλός Zp 1,16[†] (XXI,35)
 גבול ὄριον Mi 5,5(6) (IX,8)
 גבר ἀνήρ Ha 2,5 (XVII,31)
 גדול μέγας Zp 1,14[†] (XXI,27) | μεγιστάν Na 3,10[†] (XV,20)
 גדל gal μεγαλύνω Mi 5,3(4)[†] (VIII,41)
 גוב ὄχλος Na 3,17[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,37) (9)
 גוי ἔθνος Mi 4,3[†] (VII,35); Mi 4,3 (VII,35); Mi 4,7 (VIII,5); Ha 1,6 (XVI,26); Ha 1,17 (XVII,19); Ha 2,5 (XVII,34); Ha 2,8 (XVII,42); Za 8,23[†] (B1,31)
 גולה ἀποικία Na 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,16)
 גי φάραγξ Mi 1,6^{≠LXX} (IV,42)
 גיל gal χαίρω Ha 1,15(16) (XVII,14)
 גל κύμα Jo 2,4 (II,37)
 גלה pu'al ἀποκαλύπτω Na 2,8[†] (XIV,6)
- גם(ו) καί γε Na 3,10^{≠LXX} (XV,16); Na 3,10^{≠LXX} (XV,17); Na 3,11[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,21); Na 3,11[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,22); Ha 2,16^{≠LXX} (XVIII,22); Zp 1,18[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXI,39); Za 3,7^{≠LXX} (XXXI,40); Za 3,7^{≠LXX} (XXXI,41); Za 9,2^{≠LXX} (B2,7)
- גער gal ἐπιτιμάω Za 3,2[†] (XXXI,22)
 גפן ἄμπελος Mi 4,4 (VII,37)
 גרר gal σύρω Ha 1,15^{≠LXX} (XVII,11)
 גרש nif'al ἀπωθέω Jo 2,5[†] (II,38)
- דבר gal λαλέω Za 2,7(3)[†] (XXX,28) | pi'el λαλέω Jo 3,10[†] (III,34)
 דבר λόγος Jo 4,2 (III,37); Mi 1,1 (IV,27); Za 9,1 (B2,3) | ῥῆμα Jo 3,3^{≠LXX} (III,11)
 דג κῆτος Jo 2,1[†] (II,31) (10)
 דומם σιωπάω Ha 2,19^{≠LXX} (XVIII,36)
 דוש gal ἄλοάω Ha 3,12[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,34)
 די ἱκανότης Ha 2,13[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,12)
 דם αἷμα Jo 1,14[†] (II,24); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,27)
 דמשק δαμασκός Za 9,1 (B2,4)

(8) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 94.(9) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 91.(10) Or ἰχθύς; see Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 84.

דרך *qal* ἐντείνω Ha 3,15[†] ^{#LXX} (XIX,42) | ἐπιβαίνω Mi 5,4(5) (IX,2); Mi 5,5(6) (IX,8)

דרך ὁδός Jo 3,8[†] (III,28); Jo 3,10[†] (III,33); Za 3,7 (XXXI,39)

הַי ei Ha 1,17^{#LXX} (XVII,17) | μὴ Mi 4,9 (VIII,11); Na 3,8^{#LXX} (XV,11)

הי οὐαί Ha 2,6 (XVII,37); Ha 2,19[†] (XVIII,35)

היה γίγνομαι Za 1,4[†] (XXVIII,39) | εἰμί Jo 4,2[†] (III,37); Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,32); Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,34); Mi 5,4(5)[†] (VIII,42); Ha 2,7 (XVII,41)

היכל ναός Jo 2,5 (II,39); Na 2,7[†] ^{#LXX} (XIV,5); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,40)

הלא οὐ Mi 1,5[†] (IV,39) | οὐχί Mi 1,5[†] (IV,39); Ha 2,6 (XVII,35); Ha 2,7^{#LXX} (XVII,39)

הלא *nif'al* ἐκπιέζω Mi 4,7[†] ^{#LXX} (VIII,5)

הלך *qal* ἔρχομαι Za 8,21[†] ^{#LXX} (B1,15) | πορεύομαι Mi 2,7[†] (VI,3); Mi 4,5[†] (VII,40); Mi 4,5[†] (VII,41); Ha 1,6[†] (XVI,27); Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,36); Za 3,7 (XXXI,39); Za 8,21[†] (B1,17); Za 8,21[†] ^{#LXX} (B1,17) (11); Za 8,23[†] (B2,1)

הלך *pi'el* πορεύομαι Ha 3,11[†] (XIX,31)

הנה ידו Mi 1,3 (IV,33); Ha 1,6 (XVI,25); Ha 2,4[†] ^{#LXX} (XVII,29); Za 9,4^{#LXX} (B2,13)

הס σισπάω Ha 2,20^{#LXX} (XVIII,40)

הפך *nif'al* καταστρέφω Jo 3,4[†] (III,15)

הר ὄρος Jo 2,7(6)[†] (II,42); Mi 1,4 (IV,35); Mi 4,7 (VIII,6); Ha 3,10^{#LXX} (XIX,27)

הרג *qal* ἀποκτείνω (ἀποκτείνω) Ha 1,17[†] (XVII,19)

ו־ δέ Mi 4,5 (VII,41) | καὶ Jo 1,15[†] (II,26); Jo 1,16 (II,28); Jo 2,1 (II,31); Jo 2,4 (II,37); Jo 3,2[†] (III,9); Jo 3,3 (III,10); Jo 3,3^{#LXX} (III,11); Jo 3,7 (III,24); Jo 3,8 (III,26); Jo 3,8[†] (III,27); Jo 3,8 (III,28); Jo 3,9[†] (III,31); Jo 3,10 (III,32); Jo 3,10 (III,34); Jo 4,1[†] (III,35); Jo 4,1 (III,35); Jo 4,2 (III,35); Jo 4,2 (III,39); Mi 1,2 (IV,31); Mi 1,3[†] (IV,34); Mi 1,5 (IV,38); Mi 1,5[†] (IV,39); Mi 1,6[†] (IV,40); Mi 1,6 (IV,41); Jo 1,6 (IV,42); Jo 1,6 (IV,43); Mi 1,7 (V,2); Mi 2,8 (VI,3); Mi 3,6[†] (VI,41); Mi 4,3 (VII,32); Mi 4,3 (VII,33); Mi 4,3^{#MT} (VII,34); Mi 4,3 (VII,35); Mi 4,4[†] (VII,38); Mi 5,1(2) (VIII,32); Mi 5,2(3) (VIII,37); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,39); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,39); Mi 5,3(4)^{#MT} (VIII,40); Mi 5,3(4)^{#LXX} (VIII,41); Mi 5,4(5) (VIII,42); Mi 5,4(5) (IX,2); Na 2,6[†] ^{#MT} (XIV,3); Na 2,6 (XIV,3); Na 2,7 (XIV,5); Na 2,8 (XIV,6); Na 2,8 (XIV,7); Na 2,10[†] (XIV,12); Na 3,3 (XIV,35); Na 3,3 (XIV,37); Na 3,6[†] (XV,7); Na 3,9 (XV,14); Na 3,9 (XV,15); Na 3,16[†] (XV,36); Ha 1,8 (XVI,31); Ha 1,8 (XVI,32); Ha 1,8 (XVI,33); Ha 1,10 (XVI,38); Ha 1,10 (XVI,39); Ha 1,10 (XVI,41); Ha 1,11 (XVI,42); Ha 1,15^{#MT} (XVII,11); Ha 1,15 (XVII,12); Ha 1,15(16) (XVII,14); Ha 1,16 (XVII,15); Ha 1,17 (XVII,18); Ha 2,1 (XVII,20); Ha 2,1 (XVII,21); Ha 2,1

(11) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 98. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, 178 considers πόρευσις to be a valid possibility.

(XVII,22); Ha 2,2 (XVII,23); Ha 2,2 (XVII,24); Ha 2,3 (XVII,26); Ha 2,5^{≠LXX} (XVII,31); Ha 2,5 (XVII,34); Ha 2,6 (XVII,37); Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,37); Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,38); Ha 2,7 (XVII,40); Ha 2,8^{≠LXX ≠MT} (XVII,42); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,22); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,24); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,26); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,28); Ha 2,17[†] (XVIII,29); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,38); Ha 2,20^{≠LXX} (XVIII,39); Zp 1,3[†] (XX,28); Zp 1,4[†] (XX,35); Zp 1,5[†] (XX,39); Zp 1,13 (XXI,25); Zp 1,14 (XXI,28); Zp 1,15 (XXI,32); Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,33); Zp 1,17 (XXI,35); Zp 1,17 (XXI,36); Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,37); Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,38); Zp 2,9 (XXII,38); Za 3,1 (XXXI,18); Za 3,2[†] (XXXI,21); Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,28); Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,30); Za 3,5 (XXXI,34); Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,35); Za 3,7 (XXXI,42); Za 8,19 (B1,8); Za 8,19 (B1,9); Za 8,20 (B1,13); Za 8,23[†] (B1,31); Za 9,1 (B2,4); Za 9,1 (B2,6); Za 9,2 (B2,8); Za 9,3 (B2,11); Za 9,3 (B2,12); Za 9,4 (B2,14); Za 9,5[†] ^{≠LXX ≠MT} (B2,17)

זבח *qal* θυσιάζω Jo 1,16^{≠LXX} (II,28)

זבח *pi'el* θύω Ha 1,16 (XVII,14)

זבח θυσία Jo 1,16[†] (II,28)

זע *pi'pel* σαλεύω Ha 2,7^{≠LXX} (XVII,40)

זהב χρυσίον Na 2,10[†] (XIV,12); Zp 1,18[†] (XXI,40) | χρυσουῶς Ha 2,19[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,37)

זכר *qal* μιμνήσκω Na 2,6 (XIV,1)

זעם ἐμβρίμης Ha 3,12[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,33)

זרבבל ζοροβαβελ Za 4,9[†] (PAM 40.559, 2)

זרה *pi'el* λικμάω Za 2,2(1,19)[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXX,14)

זרם ἐντίναγμα Ha 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,28)

זרע *nif'al* σπείρω Na 1,14[†] (XIII,22)

חבש *qal* περιέχω Jo 2,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (II,41)

חדד *qal* ὀξύς Ha 1,8[†] (XVI,32)

חזה *hištafal* προσκυνέω Zp 1,5[†] (XX,37)

חול ἄμμος Ha 1,9 (XVI,38)

חומה τεῖχος Na 2,6 (XIV,3)

חזון ὄρασις Ha 2,2 (XVII,24)

חזק *hif'il* ἐπιλαμβάνω Za 8,23[†] (B1,29)

חטא *qal* ἔξαμαρτάνω Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,37)

חטאת ἁμαρτία Mi 1,5[†] (IV,38)

חידה διήγησις Ha 2,6 (XVII,37)

חיה *qal* ζάω Ha 2,4[†] (XVII,30)

חיל *qal* ὠδίνω Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,27)

חיל δύναμις Za 9,4[†] (B2,15)

חיל ισχύς Na 3,8^{≠LXX} (XV,13)

חיל ὠδίν Mi 4,9[†] (VIII,13)

חכם *qal* φρονέω Za 9,2[†] (B2,8)

חלף *qal* διέρχομαι Ha 1,11^{≠LXX} (XVI,42)

חלק → לחם

- מל *qal* φείδομαι Ha 1,17 (XVII,19)
 חסם ἀδικία Jo 3,8[†] (III,29); Ha 2,17^{≠LXX} (XVIII,25); Ha 2,17^{≠LXX} (XVIII,28)
 חמאθ εμαθ Za 9,2 (B2,7)
 חנן ἐλεήμων Jo 4,2[†] (III,39)
 חנית σιβύνη Mi 4,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,34)
 חרב μάχαιρα Mi 4,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,33); Mi 4,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,35); Ha 1,17^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT
 חרם; XVII,18) (12) | ῥομφαία Mi 5,5(6)[†] (IX,5); Na 3,3[†] (XIV,35)
 (13); Na 3,15[†] (XV,32)
 חריוν χρυσίον Za 9,3 (B2,12)
 חרד *hif'il* ἐκφοβέω Mi 4,4[†] (VII,38)
 חרה *qal* ἄθυμέω Jo 4,1[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,35)
 חרם ἀμφίβληστρον Ha 1,15[†] (XVII,12); Ha 1,16[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,15) | → חרב
 חרה *pi'el* ὀνειδίζω Zp 2,10[†] (XXII,41)
 חשך *qal* σκοτάζω Mi 3,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (VI,41)
 חשך σκότος Zp 1,15 (XXI,32)
 חתח *hif'il* πτοέω Ha 2,17[†] (XVIII,27)
- חוב ἀγαθός Za 1,13[†] (XXIX,38)
 חוור καθαρός Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,33)
 חוט πηλός Na 3,14[†] (XV,30)
 חל δρόσος Mi 5,6(7) (IX,10)
 חעה *hif'il* πλανάω Mi 3,5[†] (VI,36)
- יאר ποταμός Na 3,8 (XV,12)
 יד χεῖρ Zp 1,4 (XX,33)
 ידד *qal* βάλλω Na 3,10[†] (XV,19)
 ידע *qal* οἶδα Jo 3,9[†] (III,29)
 יהודה ἰουδα Mi 1,1 (IV,29); Mi 5,2(2)[†] (VIII,33); Zp 1,4[†] (XX,33)
 יהיר ἀλαζών Ha 2,5 (XVII,31)
 יום ἡμέρα Jo 2,1 (II,31); Mi 1,1[†] (IV,28); Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,35); Ha 1,5[†]
 (XVI,24); Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,30); Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,30); Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,30);
 Zp 1,15 (XXI,31); Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,32); Zp 1,16[†] (XXI,33); Za 8,23[†]
 (B1,28)
 יונה ἰωνα Jo 2,1 (II,30); Jo 3,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,10); Jo 4,1[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,35)
 יונה περιστερά Na 2,8[†] (XIV,8)
 יטב *hif'il* ἀγαθύνω Mi 2,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (VI,2); Na 3,8^{≠LXX} (XV,11)
 יין οἶνος Zp 1,13 (XXI,27)
 ילד *qal* τίκτω Mi 4,9[†] (VIII,13); Mi 5,2(3)[†] (VIII,36); Mi 5,2(3) (VIII,37)
 ים θάλασσα Jo 1,15[†] (II,26); Na 3,8 (XV,13); Ha 1,14[†] (XVII,9); Ha 2,14[†]
^{≠LXX} (XVIII,17); Za 9,4 (B2,15)
 ימן δεξιὰ Za 3,1[†] (XXXI,20)
 יסוד θεμέλιος Mi 1,6 (IV,43); Ha 3,13^{≠LXX} (XIX,37)
 יעל *hif'il* ὀφείλω Ha 2,18 (XVIII,30)
 יעקב ἰακωβ Mi 1,5 (IV,39); Mi 5,6(7) (IX,9)

(12) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 152.(13) Or μάχαιρα; see Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 89.

- יצא *qal* ἐκπορεύομαι Mi 1,3[†] (IV,33) | ἐξέρχομαι Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,33); Ha 1,7[†] (XVI,31)
- יצב *hitpa'el* στηλὼ Ha 2,1[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,20)
- יצר πλάσμα Ha 2,18 (XVIII,33)
- יצר *qal* πλάσσω Ha 2,18^{≠LXX} (XVIII,31); Ha 2,18[†] (XVIII,33)
- יקץ *qal* ἐκνήφω Ha 2,7[†] (XVII,40)
- ירא *qal* φοβέω Jo 1,16[†] (II,27)
- ירד *qal* καταβαίνω Jo 2,7 (II,42); Mi 1,3 (IV,34)
- ירה *hif'il* φωτίζω Ha 2,19[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,36)
- ים(י) ירושל' יερουσαλημ Mi 1,1[†] (IV,29); Mi 1,5 (IV,40); Mi 4,8[†] (VIII,10); Zp 1,4[†] (XX,34); Za 2,2(1,19)[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXX,15)
- ירש *qal* κατακληρονομέω Ha 1,6[†] (XVI,28)
- ירש *hif'il* κληρονομέω Za 9,4[†] (B2,13)
- ישראל ישראֵל Za 9,1 (B2,7); Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,34)
- ישב *qal* ἐνοικέω Ha 2,17[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,29) | καθίζω Mi 4,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,36) | κατοικέω Na 3,8[†] (XV,11); Zp 1,4 (XX,34); Zp 3,6[†] (XXXIII,37); Za 2,11(7)[†] (XXX,40); Za 8,21[†] (B1,15) | → שים
- ישע σωτηρία Ha 3,13[†] (XIX,34)
- ישר *qal* εὐθής Ha 2,4^{≠LXX} (XVII,29)
- יתר ἐπίλοιπος Zp 2,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXII,38)
- כ- καθώς Ha 2,5 (XVII,32); Za 1,4[†] (XXVIII,39) | κατά Jo 3,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,11) | ὥς Mi 1,4 (IV,36); Mi 4,9 (VIII,13); Mi 5,6(7) (IX,10); Na 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,7); Na 3,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,33); Na 3,15 (XV,34); Na 3,16^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT m; XV,35) (14); Ha 1,8 (XVI,35); Ha 1,9 (XVI,38); Ha 2,14 (XVIII,16); Zp 1,17 (XXI,38)
- כבד *hif'il* βαρύνω Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,38) | *hitpa'el* καταβαρύνω Na 3,15^{≠LXX} (XV,33); Na 3,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,33)
- כבוד δόξα Ha 2,16 (XVIII,22); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,25); Za 2,12(8)[†] (XXX,42)
- כה ὅδε Za 2,12(8)[†] (XXX,41); Za 3,7 (XXXI,38)
- כהן ἱερεὺς Zp 1,4[†] (XX,37)
- כוכב ἀστήρ Na 3,16^{≠LXX} (XV,35)
- כן *hof'al* ἐτοιμάζω Na 2,6[†] (XIV,3)
- כוס ποτήριον Ha 2,16[†] (XVIII,23)
- כזב *pi'el* διαψεύδω Ha 2,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,27)
- כי ὅτι Jo 3,10[†] (III,32); Mi 1,3^{≠LXX} (IV,33); Mi 1,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (V,1); Mi 4,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,38); Mi 4,5[†] (VII,39); Mi 5,3(4)^{≠LXX} (VIII,41); Mi 5,4(5)^{≠LXX} (IX,1); Mi 5,4(5)^{≠LXX} (IX,2); Mi 5,5(6)^{≠LXX} (IX,7); Ha 1,5^{≠LXX} (XVI,23); Ha 1,6^{≠LXX} (XVI,25); Ha 1,16[†] (XVII,16); Ha 2,3 (XVII,28); Ha 2,8^{≠LXX} (XVII,41); Ha 2,17^{≠LXX} (XVIII,25); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,30); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,32); Zp 2,10^{≠LXX} (XXII,41); Za 9,1^{≠LXX} (B2,5)
- כל πᾶς Mi 1,5 (IV,38); Mi 4,5 (VII,39); Na 3,10[†] (XV,18); Na 3,12[†] (XV,23); Ha 1,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,36); Ha 1,10 (XVI,40); Ha 2,5 (XVII,34); Ha 2,5 (XVII,35); Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,36); Ha 2,8[†] (XVII,42); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,29); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,38); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,41); Zp 1,4[†] (XX,34); Zp 3,7[†] (XXXIII,40); Zp 3,7 (XXXIII,42); Za 8,23[†] (B1,30); Za 9,1 (B2,6)

- כמו καθώς Ha 3,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,42)
 כמררם χωμαρειμ Zp 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,36)
 כן → כן-צל
 כסה *pi'el* καλύπτω Ha 2,17[†] (XVIII,26) | *hitpa'el* περιβάλλω Jo 3,8[†] (III,26)
 κση ἀργύριον Za 9,3[†] (B2,11) | ἀργυροῦς Ha 2,19[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,38)
 κη χεῖρ Jo 3,8 (III,29)
 כפיר λέων Na 2,14[†] (XIV,27)
 כרם ἀμπελών Zp 1,13[†] (XXI,26)
 כרת *hif'il* ἐξολεθρεύω Na 2,14[†] (XIV,28); Na 3,15[†] (XV,31); Zp 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,35)
 כשל *nif'al* ἀσθενέω Na 2,6[†] (XIV,2); Mi 3,3[†] (XIV,38)
 כתב *qal* γράφω Ha 2,2[†] (XVII,24)
 כתת *pi'el* συγκόπτω Mi 4,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (VII,32) | *hof'al* κατακόπτω Mi 1,7[†] (IV,44)
 -ל εις Jo 2,7[†] (II,41); Jo 2,7^{≠LXX} (II,42); Mi 1,2 (IV,32); Mi 1,6[†] (IV,41); Mi 1,6 (IV,42); Mi 4,3 (VII,33); Mi 4,5 (VII,42); Mi 4,7 (VIII,4); Mi 4,7 (VIII,5); Na 3,10 (XV,16); Ha 1,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,27); Ha 1,9 (XVI,36); Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,40); Ha 2,7 (XVII,41); Za 2,9(5)^{≠LXX} (XXX,34)
 לא οὐ μή Jo 3,9 (III,31); Mi 4,3^{≠LXX} (VII,34); Mi 4,3^{≠LXX} (VII,35); Ha 1,5 (XVI,24); Zp 1,13 (XXI,25) | οὐ Jo 3,10 (III,34); Na 1,14 (XIII,22); Ha 1,17 (XVII,19); Ha 2,5^{≠LXX} (XVII,31); Ha 2,6 (XVII,38)
 -ב ... לא οὐκ ἔχω Ha 1,14[†] (XVII,10)
 לוב λίβυς Na 3,9[†] (XV,15)
 לוח πυξίον Ha 2,2[†] (XVII,24)
 לחום πτόμα Zp 1,17[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXI,38)
 לחם ἄρτος Ha 1,16^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT לֶחֶם; XVII,16) (15)
 לילה νύξ Mi 3,6 (VI,40)
 לכד *qal* συλλαμβάνω Ha 1,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,41)
 למד *qal* μανθάνω Mi 4,3 (VII,35)
 לקק *qal* δέχομαι Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,38)
 מכל βρώμα Ha 1,16[†] (XVII,17)
 מאד σφόδρα Za 9,2 (B2,9)
 מאומה μηδέν Jo 3,7[†] (III,25)
 מאין πόθεν Na 3,7[†] (XV,9)
 מבצר δχύρωμα Ha 1,10 (XVI,40)
 מהה *hitpalpel* στραγγεύω Ha 2,3[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,27)
 מהלך ἐμπεριπατέω (ἐμπεριπάτημα?) Za 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXXI,42) (16) | πορεία Jo 3,3 (III,12); Jo 3,4[†] (III,13); Na 2,6[†] (XIV,2)
 מהה *pi'el* ταχύνω Na 2,6^{≠LXX} (XIV,3)

(14) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 152.

(15) Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 152.

(16) Did the translator read a *pi'el* participle? Or should the lemma rather be ἐμπεριπάτημα? Cf. Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 97.

- מהר ταχύς Zp 1,14 (XXI,28)
 מוג *nif'al* σαλεύω Na 2,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,6)
 מוסר παιδεία Zp 3,7 (XXIII,39)
 מועד καιρός Ha 2,3[†] (XVII,26)
 מוצא ἔξοδος Mi 5,1(2) (VIII,35); Za 9,3^{≠LXX} (B2,13)
 מורד κατάβασις Mi 1,4[†] (IV,37)
 מורה φαντασία Ha 2,18[†] (XVIII,32)
 מות θάνατος Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,33)
 מומרה δρέπανον Mi 4,3[†] (VII,34)
 מחצות μετέκδυμα Za 3,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXXI,32)
 מטה ῥάβδος Ha 3,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,26); Ha 3,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,39)
 מים ὕδωρ Jo 2,6 (II,40); Na 2,9[†] (XIV,9); Na 3,8[†] (XV,13); Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,28)
 מכמרת σαγήνη Ha 1,15 (XVII,13); Ha 1,16[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,15)
 מלא *nif'al* πίμπλημι Ha 2,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,14)
 מלא πλήρωμα Mi 1,2[†] ^{≠LXX} (IV,31)
 מלאך ἄγγελος Za 2,7(3)[†] (XXX,29); Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,36); Za 3,6[†] (XXXI,37)
 מלבן πλίνθειος Na 3,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,31)
 מחמה πολεμῶ Mi 4,3[†] (VII,36) | πόλεμος Mi 2,8[†] (VI,6); Mi 3,5[†] (VI,40)
 מליצה πρόβλημα Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,37)
 מלך βασιλεύς Mi 1,1 (IV,29); Mi 4,9[†] (VIII,11); Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,38)
 ממול κατέναντι Mi 2,8[†] (VI,4)
 ממשלה ἀρχή Mi 4,8 (VIII,9)
 מן ἀπό Jo 3,8 (III,29); Jo 3,9^{≠LXX} (III,31); Jo 3,10 (III,32); Mi 1,4[†] (IV,36);
 Mi 5,1(2) (VIII,35); Mi 5,1(2)^{≠LXX} (VIII,35); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,40); Za
 2,17(13)[†] (XXXI,16) | ὑπέρ Na 3,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,11) | ἐκ (ἐξ) Jo 3,8^{≠LXX}
 (III,28); Mi 1,7^{≠LXX} (V,1); Mi 5,1(2) (VIII,33); Na 1,14[†] (XIII,23); Ha
 2,16[†] (XVIII,22); Ha 3,13^{≠LXX} (XIX,36); Zp 1,4 (XX,35) | → —
 מנגד ἐξ ἐναντίας Jo 2,5^{≠LXX} (II,38)
 מנוחה κατάπαυσις Za 9,1[†] ^{≠LXX} (B2,4)
 מסכה χώνευμα Ha 2,18 (XVIII,31)
 מסס *nif'al* τήκω Mi 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (IV,34)
 מסתר (ב) κρυφή Ha 3,14^{≠LXX} (XIX,42)
 מעונה μάνδρα Na 2,13[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,24) | → מעין
 מעור ἀσχημοσύνη Ha 2,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,21)
 טעם γεύω Jo 3,7[†] (III,24)
 מעין πηγή Zp 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT מעונה; XXIII,39)
 מעל ἀπό Za 3,4^{≠LXX} (XXXI,31)
 מעשה ἔργον Jo 3,10 (III,32)
 מצולה βάθος Jo 2,4[†] (II,35)
 מצוקה στενοχωρία Zp 1,15[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXI,31)
 מצור ὄχρωμα Za 9,3[†] (B2,10) | πέτρα Ha 2,1[†] (XVII,21)
 מצרים αἴγυπτος Na 3,9[†] (XV,14)
 מקדם ἀπέναντι Jo 4,5[†] (III,44)
 מקום τόπος Zp 1,4 (XX,35)
 מר πικρός Ha 1,6 (XVI,26); Zp 1,14 (XXI,29)

- מרחב πλάτος Ha 1,6[†] (XVI,27)
 מרחב πόρρωθεν Ha 1,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,34)
 מרשתי μωρασθει Mi 1,1 (IV,28)
 משה λῆμμα Za 9,1 (B2,3)
 משה γέλως Ha 1,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,39)
 משה qal ἄρχων Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,34) | ἡγέομαι Ha 1,14 (XVII,10)
 משה παραβολή Ha 2,6 (XVII,36)
 משה φυλακή Za 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXXI,39)
 משה διαρπαγή Ha 2,7 (XVII,41)
 משפט κρίμα Ha 1,7[†] (XVI,30)
- נאם λέγω Na 2,14 (XIV,25); Zp 1,3[†] (XX,32)
 נבט hif'il ἐπιβλέπω Jo 2,5[†] (II,39); Ha 2,15[†] (XVIII,20)
 נביא προφήτης Za 1,4[†] (XXVIII,41)
 נגה φέγγος Ha 3,11 (XIX,31) (17)
 נגר hif'il κατασπάω Mi 1,6 (IV,42)
 נגר hof'al καταφέρω Mi 1,4[†] (IV,37)
 נדד qal ἀποπηδάω Na 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,8)
 נדה nif'al ἐξωθέω Mi 4,6[†] (VIII,2)
 נהג pi'el ἄγω Na 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,7)
 נהר ποταμός Jo 2,4[†] (II,36); Na 2,7 (XIV,5); Ha 3,9[†] (XIX,26)
 נוס φεύγω Na 2,9[†] (XIV,10)
 נוע nif'al σαλεύω Na 3,12[†] (XV,24)
 נחל κληρονομέω Zp 2,9[†] (XXII,39)
 נחם pi'el παρακαλέω Na 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,10) | nif'al παρακαλέω Jo 3,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,30); Jo 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,33)
 נטע qal καταφυτεύω Zp 1,13[†] (XXI,25)
 ניונה νινευη Jo 3,3[†] (III,11); Na 2,9[†] (XIV,9)
 נכה hif'il πατάσσω Za 9,4[†] (B2,14)
 נמרד νεβρωδ Mi 5,5(6) (IX,6)
 נסין ἄρχων Mi 5,4(5) ^{≠LXX} (IX,4)
 נפש ψυχή Jo 2,6 (II,40); Ha 2,4 (XVII,29); Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,32)
 נצב hof'al → צב
 נקב qal διατετραίνω Ha 3,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,39)
 נקיא ἄθῳς Jo 1,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (II,24)
 נשא qal ἀνταίρω Mi 4,3 (VII,34) | λαμβάνω Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,36)
 נשך qal δάκνω Ha 2,7 (XVII,40)
 נשר ἄετός Ha 1,8[†] (XVI,35)
 נתן qal δίδωμι Za 3,7[†] (XXXI,42); Mi 5,2(3)[†] (VIII,36); Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,28)
 נתן pi'el διαρρήγνυμι Na 1,13[†] (XIII,21)
- סבב qal κυκλώω Ha 2,16 (XVIII,23)
 סבב polel περικυκλώω Jo 2,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (II,36)
 סביב κυκλόθεν Za 2,9(5)[†] (XXX,35)

- סוף ἔλος Jo 2,6^{≠LXX} (II,41) (18) | ἔσχατος Jo 2,6[†] (II,41)
 סור *hif'il* ἀφαιρέω Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,29)
 סך *qal* ἐπικάλυμμα Na 2,6^{≠LXX} (XIV,4)
 סלה σελε Ha 3,13^{≠LXX} (XIX,38)
 סער *qal* σείω Ha 3,14[†] (XIX,40)
 ספה *pi'el* ἀνατροπή Ha 2,15[†] (XVIII,19)
 ספר *hof'al* ἐκδιηγέομαι Ha 1,5[†] (XVI,25)
- עבטט πάχος πηλοῦ Ha 2,6^{≠LXX} (XVII,39)
 עבר *qal* διέρχομαι Jo 2,4[†] (II,37) | παρέρχομαι Ha 1,11[†] ≠LXX (XVI,42)
 עבר *hif'il* ἀφαιρέω Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,30)
 עברה ὀργή Zp 1,15 (XXI,30); Zp 1,18[†] (XXI,41)
 עד ἕως Jo 2,6 (II,40); Mi 1,7^{≠LXX} (V,2); Mi 4,7[†] (VIII,7); Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,42); Ha 3,13 (XIX,37); Zp 2,9[†] ≠LXX (XXII,37) | → עוד
 עד μάρτυς Mi 1,2[†] ≠LXX (IV,32)
 עדו εἶδω Za 1,1^{≠LXX} (XXVIII,33)
 עוד עי Jo 4,2^{≠MT} (MT עי; III,37); Mi 4,3^{≠LXX} (VII,36); Ha 2,3[†] (XVII,25)
 עוד *hif'il* μαρτύρομαι Za 3,6[†] ≠LXX (XXXI,36)
 עולם αἰών Mi 4,7 (VIII,7)
 עוף *qal* ἐκπετάννυμι Na 3,16[†] (XV,36) | πετάζω Ha 1,8[†] (XVI,35)
 עור *qal* ἐξεγείρω Ha 2,19[†] (XVIII,35) | *hif'il* Ha 3,9[†] ≠LXX ≠MT (MT *nif'al*; XIX,25) (19); Za 2,17(13)[†] (XXXI,16)
 עז ισχύς Mi 5,3(4)[†] (VIII,39)
 עי ὀπωροφυλάκιον Mi 1,6[†] (IV,40)
 עין ὀφθαλμός Za 9,1[†] ≠LXX (B2,5); Jo 2,5 (II,38)
 עיר πόλις Jo 3,4[†] (III,13); Jo 4,5[†] (III,44); Zp 1,16[†] (XXI,34); Za 1,12[†] (XXIX,35); Za 8,20 (B1,14)
 על-כן διὰ τοῦτο Mi 1,8[†] ≠LXX (V,3); Mi 3,6[†] (VI,40); Mi 5,2(3) (VIII,36); Ha 1,15(16)^{≠LXX} (XVII,13); Ha 1,16^{≠LXX} (XVII,14); Ha 1,17[†] (XVII,17); Zp 2,9[†] (XXII,33); Zp 3,7^{≠LXX} (XXIII,41)
 על διά Ha 2,17 (XVIII,27) | ἐπί Jo 2,4[†] (II,37); Jo 3,10 (III,33); Mi 4,7 (VIII,6); Mi 5,2(3) (VIII,38); Mi 5,4(5) (IX,3); Ha 2,6^{≠LXX} (XVII,38); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,23); Ha 2,18^{≠LXX} (XVIII,33); Zp 1,4 (XX,33); Zp 1,5[†] (XX,38); Zp 1,16 (XXI,34); Zp 2,10 (XXII,42); Za 3,5 (XXXI,33); Za 3,5 (XXXI,35) | κατά Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,36)
 עלה *hif'il* ἀνασπάω Ha 1,15 (XVII,11)
 עלילה ἐπιτήδευμα Zp 3,7[†] ≠LXX (XXIII,42)
 עליצות γαυρία Ha 3,14^{≠LXX} (XIX,41)
 עם λαός Mi 4,5[†] (VII,40); Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,35); Ha 3,13[†] (XIX,35); Zp 2,9 (XXII,37); Zp 2,10^{≠LXX} (XXII,42); Za 8,20 (B1,13)
 עם μετά Mi 2,7[†] (VI,2); Zp 1,4[†] ≠LXX (XX,37); Za 8,23 (B2,1); Za 8,23 (B2,2)

(18) The translator obviously read סוף twice. For ἔλος ~ סוף, compare Ex 2,3,5.

(19) In Ha 3,9 the translator probably read a *hif'il*; see Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 147.

עמד *qal* ἵστημι Mi 5,3(4)[†] (VIII,39); Na 2,9[†] ≠LXX (XIV,10); Ha 2,1[†] (XVII,20)

ענה *qal* ἀποκρίνομαι Ha 2,2 (XVII,23)

עני πτωχός Ha 3,14 (XIX,42)

עפל αὐχμώδης Mi 4,8[†] (VIII,8)

עפל *pu'al* → הפלֵא

עפר χοῦς Za 9,3 (B2,12) | χῶμα Ha 1,10 (XVI,41)

עץ ξύλον Ha 2,19 (XVIII,35)

עצב εἶδωλον Mi 1,7[†] (V,1)

עצום ισχυρός Mi 4,7 (VIII,5)

(ה)עצום ισχύς Na 3,9 (XV,14)

ערב ἐσπέρα Ha 1,8[†] ≠LXX (XVI,33)

ערפל γνόφος Zp 1,15[†] ≠LXX (XXI,33)

עשב χόρτος Mi 5,6(7)[†] ≠LXX (IX,11)

עשה *qal* ποιέω Jo 3,10 (III,34); Ha 2,18[†] (XVIII,34)

עשר δέκα Za 8,23[†] (B1,29)

עתה νῦν Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,41)

פגר πτώσις (?) Na 3,3[†] (XIV,37) (20)

פה στόμα Mi 4,4 (VII,38); Na 3,12[†] (XV,25)

פוח *hif'il* ἐμφαίνω Ha 2,3[†] ≠LXX (XVII,26)

פוט φουδ Na 3,9[†] ≠LXX (XV,15)

פוץ *hif'il* σκορπίζω Ha 3,14[†] ≠LXX (XIX,41)

פוש *qal* ὀρμάω Ha 1,8[†] ≠LXX (XVI,33)

פלל *hitpa'el* προσεύχω Jo 4,2[†] (III,35)

פנה γωνία Zp 1,16[†] (XXI,35)

פנה *hif'il* ἐπιστρέφω Na 2,9[†] ≠LXX (XIV,11)

פנים πρόσωπον Ha 1,9 (XVI,37); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,41); Zp 1,2[†] (XX,26); Zp 1,3[†] (XX,32)

פסיל γλυπτός Mi 1,7 (IV,44); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,30)

פסל *qal* γλύφω Ha 2,18[†] (XVIII,31)

פעל ἔργον Ha 1,5[†] (XVI,23)

פרז ἀτείχιστος Ha 3,14[†] ≠LXX (XIX,40); Za 2,8(4)[†] ≠LXX (XXX,32)

פרש ἵππεύς Ha 1,8[†] ≠LXX (XVI,34)

פשט *hif'il* ἐκδύω Mi 2,8[†] ≠LXX (VI,5)

פשע ἀσέβεια Mi 1,5 (IV,39)

פתח *nif'al* ἀνοίγω Na 2,7[†] ≠LXX (XIV,5); Na 3,13[†] (XV,27)

פתח → פתחֵה

פתחה παραξίφίς Mi 5,5(6)[†] ≠LXX ≠MT (MT פתחֵה; IX,6) (21)

פתע ἐξαίφνης Ha 2,7[†] (XVII,39)

(20) Other possibilities: πτώμα, σῶμα. See Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 89.

(21) Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 88; Barthélemy, “Redécouverte d'un chaînon manquant,” 27.

- צב** λαμπήνη Na 2,8^{≠LXX ≠MT} (MT **צב** *hof^aal*; XIV,6)
צבא δύναμις Mi 4,4^{† ≠LXX} (VII,39); Ha 2,13^{† ≠LXX} (XVIII,11); Za 1,3^{† ≠LXX} (XXVIII,36); Za 1,3^{† ≠LXX} (XXVIII,37); Za 1,3^{† ≠LXX} (XXVIII,39); Za 1,4^{≠LXX} (XXVIII,42); Za 1,14^{† ≠LXX} (XXIX,40); Za 3,7^{† ≠LXX} (XXXI,38); Za 8,20^{† ≠LXX} (B1,12)
צבר *qal* βάλλω Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,41) | βουνίζω Za 9,3^{≠LXX} (B2,11)
צדה *nif'al* ἀπόλλυμι Zp 3,6^{† ≠LXX} (XXIII,35) (22)
צדיק δίκαιος Ha 2,4[†] (XVII,30)
צואר τράχηλος Ha 3,13[†] (XIX,37)
צום νηστεία Za 8,19[†] (B1,6)
צידן σειδων Za 9,2[†] (B2,8)
ציון σειων Mi 4,7[†] (VIII,6); Mi 4,10[†] (VIII,14); Za 1,14[†] (XXIX,42)
צלע *qal* ἐκθλίβω Mi 4,7^{† ≠LXX} (VIII,4)
צניף κίδαρις Za 3,5 (XXXI,33); Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,34)
צעיר ὀλιγοστός Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,32)
צפה *pi'el* ἀποσκοπεύω Ha 2,1 (XVII,21)
צר τύρος Za 9,2 (B2,8); Za 9,3 (B2,10)
צרה ἀπορία Zp 1,15^{≠LXX} (XXI,31) | θλίψις Jo 2,3[†] (II,33)
צרה ἐπισ[Zp 1,14^{† ≠LXX} (XXI,29) (23)
צרר *hif'il* ἐκθλίβω Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,35)
קבץ *qal* ἀθροίζω Ha 2,5^{† ≠LXX} (XVII,35)
קדימה καύσων Ha 1,9^{≠LXX} (XVI,37)
קדם ἀρχή Mi 5,1(2)[†] (VIII,35)
קדם *pi'el* προφθάνω Jo 4,2[†] (III,37)
קדש ἅγιος Jo 2,5[†] (II,39); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,40)
קום *polel* ἀνθίστημι Mi 2,8[†] (VI,4)
קום *qal* ἀνίστημι Ha 2,7 (XVII,39)
קום *hif'il* ἐπεγείρω Mi 5,4(5) (IX,3)
קטר *pi'el* θυμιάω Ha 1,16 (XVII,15)
קיא ἔμετος Ha 2,16^{≠LXX ≠MT} (MT קיקלן; XVIII,24) (24)
קיץ *hif'il* ἐκνήφω Ha 2,19 (XVIII,35)
קיקלן → קיא
קלל *qal* κοῦφος Ha 1,8^{† ≠LXX} (XVI,31)
קלס *hitpa'el* ἐμπαίζω Ha 1,10^{† ≠LXX} (XVI,39)
קצף *qal* ὀργίζω Za 1,2[†] (XXVIII,34)
קרא *qal* ἀναγινώσκω Ha 2,2 (XVII,25) | ἀνακράζω Za 1,14[†] (XXIX,39) | καλέω Za 1,4^{≠LXX} (XXVIII,40) | κηρύσσω Jo 3,2[†] (III,9); Jo 3,5[†] (III,16)
קרב μέσος Ha 2,19^{≠LXX} (XVIII,39)
קרוב ἐγγύς Zp 1,14 (XXI,27); Zp 1,14 (XXI,28)
קריה πόλις Ha 2,17 (XVIII,28)

(22) See Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 95.(23) Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, 177 reconstructed ἐπίσημος.(24) Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 93.

קָרָא זא 2,4(1,21)[†] (XXX,18)

קָשָׁת תֹּזֶן Ha 3,9[†] (XIX,25)

רָאָה qal ὁράω Jo 3,10[†] (III,32); Ha 2,1[†] (XVII,21); Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,27); Za 9,5[†] (B2,17)

רָאָה hif'il δείκνυμι Za 3,1[†] (XXXI,18)

רָאָה κεφαλὴ Jo 2,6 (II,41); Na 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,18) (25); Ha 3,13[†] (XIX,36); Ha 3,14 (XIX,39); Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,35)

רָאָה εἰμπροσθεν Za 1,4 (XXVIII,41)

רָבָה πληθος Na 3,3[†] (XIV,36); Za 2,8(4)[†] (XXX,33)

רָבָה πολὺς Mi 4,3[†] (VII,31); Ha 2,8 (XVII,42); Za 8,20[†] (B1,14)

רָבָה hif'il πληθύνω Na 3,16[†] (XV,34); Ha 2,6 (XVII,38)

רוּחַ πνεῦμα Ha 1,11 (XVI,42); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,38)

רוּץ qal τρέχω Ha 2,2[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,25)

רוּץ polet τρέχω Na 2,5[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIII,42)

רוּץ τύραννος Ha 1,10 (XVI,39)

רוּחַ μακρός Mi 4,3[†] (VII,32)

רוּץ hif'il ἐκκενόω Ha 1,17[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVII,18); Ha 3,13[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,37)

רוּץ κενός Ha 2,13^{≠LXX} (XVIII,14)

רַע πλησίον Ha 2,15[†] (XVIII,18)

רַע κακία Jo 3,10[†] (III,34) | λύπη Jo 4,1[†] (III,35) | πονηρός Jo 3,8[†] (III,28); Jo 3,10[†] (III,33)

רַע qal ποιμαίνω Mi 5,3(4)[†] (VIII,39); Mi 5,5(6)[†] (IX,4)

רַע ποιμήν Mi 5,4(5)[†] (IX,3)

רַע hif'il κακώω Mi 4,6[†] ^{≠LXX} (VIII,3)

רַע qal λυπέω Jo 4,1[†] (III,35)

רַע ἀσεβής Ha 3,13[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIX,36)

שָׁבַע qal ἐπιμύλημι Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,33); Ha 2,16[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVIII,21)

שָׁדָה ἄγρός Mi 1,6[†] (IV,41)

שָׁחַץ qal ἐμπαίζω Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,40)

שָׁטַן διάβολος Za 3,1[†] (XXXI,20)

שָׁם ἐπιτίθημι Za 3,5[†] (XXXI,34) | τίθημι Mi 1,6[†] (IV,40); Mi 1,7[†] (V,1); Mi 4,7 (VIII,3); Na 3,6 (XV,7); Za 2,8(4)[†] ^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT ישב XXX,32) (26)

שָׁמַח qal εὐφραίνω Ha 1,15(16)[†] (XVII,13)

שָׁמַח εὐφροσύνη Za 8,19[†] (B1,8)

שָׁרַץ nif'al ἐπιμύλημι Mi 1,7[†] (IV,45)

שָׂאָה qal ὑδρεύω Na 3,14[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,29)

שָׂאָה ἄδης Ha 2,5 (XVII,32)

שָׂאָה ὑπόλειμμα Zp 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX} (XX,36)

(25) The rendering here could also be ἀρχή; cf. Barthélemy, *Les devanciers d'Aquila*, 174; Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 90.

(26) Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 96.

- שׂאֲרִית ὑπόλειμμα Mi 4,7[†] (VIII,4) | κατάλοιπος Mi 5,6(7)[†] ^{≠LXX} (IX,8)
 שבט φυλή Za 9,1[†] (B2,6)
 שׁבִי αἰχμαλωσία Na 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,16); Ha 1,9 (XVI,38)
 שׁבע *nif'al* ὄμνυμι Zp 1,5[†] (XX,39)
 שׁבעָ ἐπτά Mi 5,4(5) (IX,3)
 שׁבעִים ἑβδομηκοστός Za 1,12[†] (XXIX,35)
 שׁד τάλαιπωρία Ha 2,17 (XVIII,26)
 שׁדד *pu'al* τάλαιπωρέω Na 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XV,8)
 שׁוב *qal* ἐπιστρέφω Jo 3,8[†] (III,28); Jo 3,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,30); Jo 3,9[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,30);
 Jo 3,10[†] ^{≠LXX} (III,32); Mi 1,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (V,3); Mi 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (VI,6); Mi 5,2(3)[†]
 (VIII,38); Mi 5,3(4)[†] ^{≠LXX} (VIII,41); Za 1,3[†] (XXVIII,37); Za 1,4[†] ^{≠LXX}
 (XXVIII,42) (27)
 שׁוב *hif'il* ἀποκρίνομαι Ha 2,1[†] (XVII,22)
 שׁופר κερατίνη Zp 1,16[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXI,33)
 שׁחת *hif'il* διαφθείρω Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,41)
 שׁלל (*q're* שׁולל) ἀνυπόδετος Mi 1,8[†] (V,4)
 שׁכם *hif'il* ὀρθρίζω Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,41)
 שׁכר *qal* μεθύσκω Na 3,11[†] (XV,21)
 שׁלום εἰρήνη Za 8,19 (B1,10)
 שׁלש τρεῖς Jo 2,1 (II,31); Jo 2,1[†] (II,31); Jo 3,3[†] (III,12)
 שׁלח *qal* ἀποστέλλω Za 2,12(8)[†] (XXX,42) | ἐξαποστέλλω Za 4,9[†] (PAM
 40.559, 5)
 שׁלך *hif'il* ἀπορρίπτω Jo 2,4[†] (II,35)
 שׁלל *qal* σκυλεύω Ha 2,8[†] (XVII,41); Ha 2,8[†] (XVII,42)
 שׁם ὄνομα Mi 5,3(4) (VIII,40); Zp 1,4 (XX,36)
 שׁמים οὐρανός Zp 1,3[†] (XX,29); Zp 1,5[†] (XX,38)
 שׁמן λιπαίνω Ha 1,16 (XVII,16)
 שׁמנה ὀκτώ Mi 5,4(5) (IX,4)
 שׁמע *qal* ἀκούω Mi 1,2[†] (IV,30); Za 8,23[†] (B2,2)
 שׁמר *qal* φυλάσσω Za 3,7 (XXXI,40); Za 3,7[†] ^{≠LXX} (XXXI,41)
 שׁמרן σαμαροια Mi 1,5[†] (IV,39); Mi 1,6[†] (IV,40)
 שׁמש ἥλιος Mi 3,6 (VI,42)
 שׁער πύλη Na 2,7[†] (XIV,5)
 שׁקה *hif'il* ποτίζω Ha 2,15[†] (XVIII,18)
 שׁקר ψευδής Ha 2,18 (XVIII,32)
 שׁתה *qal* πίνω Jo 3,7[†] (III,25); Ha 2,16[†] (XVIII,22)
- תאנא σικῆ Mi 4,4[†] (VII,37)
 תהום ἄβυσσος Jo 2,6 (II,40); Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,29)
 תחת ὑποκάτω Mi 4,4 (VII,37) | ὑποκάτωθεν Mi 1,4[†] (IV,35)
 תמה *qal* θαυμάζω Ha 1,5[†] ^{≠LXX} (XVI,23) (28)

(27) ἀποστρέφω (= LXX) is also possible, cf. Tov, *The Minor Prophets Scroll*, 96.

(28) θαυμάζω could also be the rendering of תמה *hitpa'el*; see Tov, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 91.

תמיד *dià pantós* Ha 1,17[†] (XVII,18)

הפל *polel* ἀποφθέγγομαι Na 2,8[†] ^{≠LXX} (XIV,8)

פשו *qal* σάπτω Ha 2,19^{≠LXX} (XVIII,37)

Article $\delta \rightarrow \text{Tov}$, *The Greek Minor Prophets Scroll*, 106-120

Personal pronoun αὐτός Na 2,9 (XIV,10); Na 3,10 (XV,16); Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,38); Ha 1,10[†] (XVI,40); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,36); Ha 2,19^{≠LXX} (XVIII,37); Za 9,4 (B2,16) | ἐγώ Jo 2,5[†] (II,38) | σύ Mi 5,2(1) (VIII,32); Na 3,11 (XV,22); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,22); Za 3,7 (XXXI,40) | ἡμεῖς Mi 4,5 (VII,41)

Pronominal suffix αὐτός Jo 2,2[†] (II,32); Jo 2,7 (II,42); Jo 2,8[†] (III,28); Jo 3,8 (III,29); Jo 3,9[†] (III,31); Jo 3,10[†] (III,32); Jo 3,10[†] (III,33); Jo 3,10[†] (III,34); Mi 1,2[†] (IV,31); Mi 1,6 (IV,43); Mi 1,7 (IV,44); Mi 1,7 (IV,45); Mi 1,7[†] (V,1); Mi 2,8[†] (VI,5); Mi 3,5[†] (VI,38); Mi 3,5[†] (VI,39); Mi 4,3[†] (VII,33); Mi 4,3[†] (VII,34); Mi 4,4[†] (VII,37); Mi 4,4[†] (VII,38); Mi 4,5 (VII,40); Mi 4,7 (VIII,6); Mi 5,2(1) (VIII,35); Mi 5,3(2) (VIII,38); Mi 5,5(4) (IX,3); Na 2,6 (XIV,1); Na 2,6 (XIV,2); Na 2,8 (XIV,7); Na 3,9[†] (XV,14); Na 3,10[†] (XV,19); Na 3,10[†] (XV,20); Ha 1,7 (XVI,30); Ha 1,8[†] (XVI,32); Ha 1,8^{≠LXX} (XVI,34); Ha 1,9 (XVI,37); Ha 1,15^{≠LXX} (XVII,12); Ha 1,15 (XVII,13); Ha 1,16 (XVII,15); Ha 1,16[†] (XVII,16); Ha 1,16 (XVII,16); Ha 1,16 (XVII,17); Ha 1,17 (XVII,18); Ha 2,3[†] (XVII,28); Ha 2,4^{≠LXX} (XVII,29); Ha 2,4^{≠LXX} (XVII,30); Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,34); Ha 2,5[†] (XVII,35); Ha 2,6[†] (XVII,36); Ha 2,6 (XVII,37); Ha 2,6 (XVII,38); Ha 2,7[†] (XVII,41); Ha 2,15[†] (XVIII,21); Ha 2,17[†] (XVIII,30); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,31); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,31); Ha 2,18 (XVIII,33); Ha 2,18^{≠LXX} (XVIII,33); Ha 2,19 (XVIII,39); Ha 2,20[†] (XVIII,40); Ha 2,20 (XVIII,41); Ha 3,10[†] (XIX,30); Za 3,5 (XIX,35); Ha 3,14^{≠LXX} (XIX,39); Ha 3,14^{≠LXX} (XIX,40); Ha 3,14 (XIX,41); Zp 1,13 (XXI,27); Zp 1,17[†] (XXI,38); Zp 1,18[†] (XXI,40); Zp 2,10[†] (XXII,40); Zp 2,10 (XXII,41); Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,40); Zp 3,7[†] (XXIII,41); Za 1,3[†] (XXVIII,35); Za 1,4[†] (XXVIII,40); Za 3,1[†] (XXXI,20); Za 3,4[†] (XXXI,29); Za 3,4 (XXXI,30); Za 9,2[†] (B2,7); Za 9,4 (B2,14) | ἑαυτοῦ Ha 2,6^{≠LXX} (XVII,38) | σεαυτοῦ Na 3,14[†] (XV,29) | ἐγώ Jo 2,4[†] (II,35); Jo 2,4[†] (II,36); Jo 2,4 (II,37); Jo 2,6^{≠LXX} (II,40); Jo 2,6 (II,41); Jo 2,7^{≠LXX} (II,42); Jo 4,2 (III,37); Mi 5,2(1) (VIII,33); Ha 1,6 (XVI,25); Ha 2,1 (XVII,20); Ha 2,1 (XVII,22); Ha 2,2^{≠LXX} (XVII,23); Zp 1,4 (XX,33); Zp 2,9[†] (XXII,38); Za 3,7 (XXXI,39); Za 3,7 (XXXI,40); Za 3,7 (XXXI,41) | σύ Jo 2,4[†] (II,37); Jo 2,5 (II,38); Jo 2,5 (II,39); Jo 3,2 (III,10); Mi 4,9 (VIII,12); Mi 5,2(1) (VIII,33); Na 2,14[†] (XIV,25); Na 2,14[†] (XIV,27); Na 3,7 (XV,8); Na 3,15 (XV,32); Ha 2,7^{≠LXX} (XVII,40); Ha 2,7^{≠LXX} (XVII,41); Ha 2,16 (XVIII,23); Ha 2,16[†] (XVIII,25); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,26); Ha 2,17 (XVIII,27); Ha 3,13 (XIX,36); Za 3,4^{≠LXX} (XXXI,31); Za 3,4^{≠LXX} (XXXI,32); Za 3,7 (XXXI,42) | ἡμεῖς Mi 4,5 (VII,42); Mi 5,5(4)[†] (IX,2); Ha 3,14^{≠LXX} ^{≠MT} (MT *suffix 1st person*; XIX,41) | ὑμεῖς Mi 1,2 (IV,32); Mi 3,6[†] (VI,41);

Ha 1,5 (XVI,24); Za 1,3 (XXVIII,38); Za 1,4 (XXVIII,40); Za 8,23[†]
^{≠LXX} (B2,1)

Demonstrative pronoun οὗτος Mi 1,5[†] (IV,38); Mi 1,8[†] (V,3); Ha 2,6
 (XVII,36); Zp 1,4[†] (XX,35); Za 1,19(2,2)[†] (XXX,13); Za 4,9[†] (PAM
 40.559, 3) | ἐκεῖνος Zp 1,15[†] (XXI,30); Za 8,23[†] (B1,28)

Interrogative pronoun τίς Jo 3,9 (III,29); Ha 2,1 (XVII,22); Ha 2,18
 (XVIII,30)

Plus in Minor Prophets Scroll εἰμί Za 1,19(2,1)[†] (XXX,13) | εἰς Jo 2,4[†]
 (II,35) | ἐν Zp 1,4^{≠LXX} (XX,34) | ἐπὶ Na 2,6 (XIV,3); Ha 2,18
 (XVIII,33)

Dries DE CROM, Elke VERBEKE and
 Reinhart CEULEMANS
 Centre for Septuagint Studies and
 Textual Criticism, K.U.Leuven

THE FRAGMENTS OF *CANTICLES* FROM QUMRAN:

Implications and Limitations for Interpretation

Abstract

This article reviews the textual evidence for *Canticles* at Qumran, specifically examining the two “abbreviated” manuscripts (*4QCant^{a,b}*) which omit segments of the canonical text. While these omissions are clearly evident, the reason for such abbreviation is anything but clear. Various motivations have been suggested to explain this phenomenon, yet many of these theories conflict with evidence in the *Song* or the non-biblical scrolls. While these manuscripts likely served a purpose other than transmitting Scripture, the present lack of internal & external evidence prevents further conclusions regarding the function of these fragments. Thus, scholars should avoid using *4QCant^{a,b}* as support for speculation on the use of similar fragments or the interpretation of *Canticles* at Qumran. Numerous questions are put forward in an attempt to advance research on the use of these fragments.

Introduction

THE history of interpretation of *Canticles* contains an interesting paradox. Often ignored by many today, this biblical book has held an important position in the exegetical history of both Jews and Christians. Early catalogs and bibliographies list more commentaries on the *Song* than on any other biblical book save *Psalms*, more than all of Paul’s epistles taken together, and the gospels. (1) In fact, the earliest comments regarding its interpretation indicate that *Song of Songs* was considered an extremely important yet controversial book already in the late 2nd c. CE. For example, the Mishnah

(1) George L. Scheper, “Reformation Attitudes toward Allegory and the Song of Songs,” *PMLA* 89:3 (1974): 556. In the eighteenth century, the most complete bibliography listed over 400 commentaries on *Song of Songs*. Jacques Le Long, *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Paris: F. Montalant, 1723), 1113-17.

records Rabbi Aqiba's famous words, "For all the ages are not worth the day on which Song of Songs was given to Israel, for all the Writings are holy, but Song of Songs is the Holy of Holies" (*m. Yad* 3:5, *t. Yad* 2:14). In *Aggadat Shir Hashirim*, the same Jewish sage is attributed this classic statement on the *Song*'s supreme importance, "If Torah had not been given, Song of Songs would be enough to guide the world."⁽²⁾ Yet the *Song*'s interpretation was already stirring up heated debate, aptly illustrated by Aqiba's well-known warning, "Whoever sings the Song with a tremulous voice in a banquet hall and so treats it as a love song has no share in the world to come" (*t. Sanh* 12:10; *b. Sanh* 101a). These comments imply that opposing approaches to this important book were already present in the 2nd c. CE. But is there any earlier evidence? Like most biblical books, the earliest manuscript evidence for *Song of Songs* is found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. The purpose of this article is to examine the unique fragments of *Canticles* from Qumran and explore possible implications and limitations for the interpretation of this important yet debated book.

Textual Evidence

Among the Qumran scrolls, four manuscripts of *Canticles* were found (ten fragments), three from Cave 4 and one from Cave 6. These four copies contain remnants of 47 of the *Song*'s 117 verses, from seven of the book's eight chapters. Yardeni dated these fragments within a 100 year span, from the early Herodian period to ca. 50 CE. The table below summarizes their contents: (3)

<i>4QCanr^a</i> (4Q106)		<i>4QCanr^b</i> (4Q107)		<i>4QCanr^c</i> (4Q108)	<i>6QCant</i> (6Q6)
(Early Herodian)		(End of 1 st Century BCE)		(Herodian?)	(ca. 50 CE)
col I	3:4-5	frg. 1	2:9-3:2	3:7-8	1:1-7
col II	3:7-4:6	frg. 2 i	3:5, 9-4:1a		
col III	4:7; 6:11?-7:7	frg. 2 ii	4:1b-3, 8-11a		
		frg. 3	4:14-5:1		

(2) Solomon Schechter, "Agadath Shir Hashirim," *JQR* 6:4 (1896): 674 (Ins 22-23). This collection of Midrashim, likely not compiled until the 10th c. CE, may preserve a later variant of the tradition attributed to Aqiba in the Mishnah.

(3) Emanuel Tov, "Canticles," in *Qumran Cave 4.XI: Psalms to Chronicles* (eds. Eugene Ulrich, et al.; DJD XVI; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000), 195; idem, "Three Manuscripts (Abbreviated Texts?) of Canticles from Qumran Cave 4," *JJS* 46 (1995): 88; M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, and R. de Vaux, *Les 'Petites Grottes' de Qumran: Exploration de la falaise, Les grottes 2Q, 3Q, 5Q, 6Q, 7Q, à 10Q* (DJD III; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1962), 112-13. Milik's original list also included a commentary on *Canticles* (4Q240), but this fragment has never been located.

Two of the manuscripts from Cave 4 contain significant differences from other textual witnesses of the *Song*. Both *4QCant^a* and *4QCant^b* lack substantial segments of the canonical text. The three fragments of *4QCant^b* include verses spanning four chapters of the *Song* (2:9-5:1). In column II (frg. 2 i), the preserved text contains four letters from the adjuration refrain (3:5) at the end of lines 5-6. However, the single word evident at the close of the following line begins 3:9, with subsequent lines containing remnants of 3:10-4:1. Thus, this fragment likely indicates an omission of three verses, 3:6-8. A similar phenomenon is noted in column III (frg. 2 ii). The first six lines of this fragment preserve remnants of 4:1b-3, ending in the middle of line 6. After an opening space, line 7 begins with the first word of 4:8, clearly omitting verses 4-7 of chapter 4. (4)

Col. II: Frg. 2 i, lines 5-9 (3: 5, 9-10)	Col. III: Frg. 2 ii, lines 3-7 (4:2-3, 8)
5 [אל בית אמי ואל חדר הורתי ⁵ השבעתי אתכ]מה	3 2 שניך כעדר הקנצובות שעלו [מן ה]רחצה[
6 [בנות ירושלם בצבאות או באילות השדה אם תעירו	4 שכלם מתאמנות ושכלה אין [בהם ³ כחוט
7 [וואם תעוררו את האהבה עד שתחפץ [א ⁹ פרייו]]	5 השני שפתותיך ומדברך נאווה כפלח הרמון
8 [עשה לו המלך שלמה מן עצי הלבנון] vacat	6 רקתך ומבעד לצמתך vacat
9 [עמודיו עשה כסף רפידתו זהב מ]רכבו ארגמן	7 vacat ⁸ את מן לבנון כלה את מלבנון

Furthermore, the first two columns of *4QCant^a* contain verses from chapters 3 and 4. Since the final word of column II (הלבונה) concludes 4:6 and the first word of column III (כלןך) begins 4:7, column III clearly continues the text of the previous column. No additional text has been preserved in lines 1-3 of column III. However, the single word evident from line 4 (פרחה) and the preserved text in lines 5 (מרכ[בות]) and 6 (מה תחיון]) clearly indicate a shift to chapters 6 and 7 of the *Song*. Though admittedly the fragmentary nature of the manuscript makes determining when the scribe shifted from chapter 4 to the end of chapter 6 impossible, a portion of the canonical text was clearly omitted. Since the Masoretes marked the end of a content unit after 4:7 and again after 6:10, the editor's proposed reconstruction, namely, the juxtaposition of 4:7 and 6:11-7:7 with an empty line intervening between them, seems most probable. (5)

Col. III: Frg. 2 ii, lines 1-5 (4:7, 6:11?-7:1)	
[כלןך יפה רעיתי ומום אין בך vacat?	1 4:7
[vacat?	2]
[אל גנת אגוז ירדתי לראות באבי הנחל לראות אם] 6:11	3
פרחה[הגפן הנצו הרמנים ¹² לא ידעתי נפשי שמתני]	4
מרכ[בות עמי נדיב ¹¹ שובי שובי השולמית שובי שובי ונחזה בך]	5

(4) Tov, "Canticles," 214; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 106.

(5) Tov, "Canticles," 202-03; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 95-97. The identification of this fragment as *Canticles* is supported by the phrases "eyes like pools in Heshbon," and "Lebanon, overlooking Damascus" in lines 11-12.

In summary, these two copies of *Canticles* found at Qumran contain three separate omissions: *4QCant^b* lacks 3:6-8 (col. II, frg. 2 i) and 4:4-7 (col. III, frg. 2 ii) while *4QCant^a* omits 4:8-6:10 (col. III, frg. 2 ii). Although the fact that these fragments lack portions of the canonical text seems clear enough, the reason or motivation for such an omission is anything but clear.

Reasons for Omissions

Whenever an omission is encountered in a copy of the biblical text, scholars must consider whether the absence is best explained as an unintentional scribal error caused by faulty sight/hearing or as an intentional exclusion motivated by various reasons. In the case of the fragments of *4QCant^{a,b}*, the evidence favors an intentional omission. In the *editio princeps*, Tov concludes, "The shorter text of the two scrolls was created consciously by the scribes or their predecessors, who shortened the content of the biblical book, and not by scribal negligence." (6) Garrett also advocates this view, "A curiosity of the Cave 4 fragments is that they are selective; that is, they deliberately skip sections of the Song." (7) Three main reasons support this conclusion. First, the omission in *4QCant^a* is very large, about 30 percent of the canonical text. As the editor has noted, "This omission would have involved several columns in a scroll of such small dimensions." (8) A scribal error of sight or hearing does not adequately explain this absence. Second, the scribe of *4QCant^b* left space at the conclusion of line 6 (vs. 3) and beginning of line 7 (vs. 8). Third, the three sets of verses absent from the *Canticles* manuscripts conclude individual literary units (3:6-8, 4:4-7, 4:8-6:10). In all three instances, the sigla ׀ in the MT indicates that the final verse of each set marks the conclusion of a content unit. (9) Intentional abbreviation may also be supported by the probable conclusion of *4QCant^b* at 5:1, the end of a poetic unit and mid-mark of the book. (10)

(6) Tov, "Canticles," 195; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 88-89.

(7) Duane Garrett and Paul R. House, *Song of Songs/Lamentations* (WBC 23b; Nashville: Thomas Nelson, 2004), 16.

(8) Tov, "Canticles," 195; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 89. Although Nebe suggests the abbreviation in *4QCant^a* resulted from haplography, confusing לבונה (4:6, 6:10) and יפה (4:7, 6:10), the size of the omission weighs against this proposal. G. W. Nebe, "Qumranica I: Zu veröffentlichten Handschriften aus Höhle 4 von Qumran," ZAW 106:2 (1994): 310.

(9) With the exception of 4:4, the first verse of each omitted section also opens a new content unit (3:6, 4:8).

(10) The large letters of the final word ׀ר׀ים and space extending to the bottom margin favor this probability. Also, traces of a *gamma* are evident at the left edge, a sign used to separate sections in Greek tragedies/comedies.

Erotic Nature

Although most agree that these verses were intentionally omitted from the *Song*, much debate exists over the reason or motivation for such abbreviation. First, some scholars have suggested that these passages were omitted from the text due to the graphic nature of their content. In his summary of the fragmentary evidence for *Canticles* at Qumran, Flint posits this rationale, "One explanation for the long glaring omission is the sensual language and erotic imagery found in much of Cant 4:8 to 6:10. Perhaps an ancient scribe or copyist wished to limit the amount of material that was no doubt controversial to some." (11) These comments echo early explanations given for this book's limited attestation among the Dead Sea Scrolls. In response to arguments for a Hellenistic (or later) date of authorship, Pope contends that the scant remains of *Canticles* at Qumran should be viewed as an indication that the book was not considered "edifying," and therefore omitted from their library. (12) In both cases, the authors insinuate that *Song of Songs* may have been censored by the Qumran community due to the sexual nature of its content.

Three main pieces of evidence could be marshaled in support of this proposed explanation. First, the passages omitted from these manuscripts certainly contain sensual material. In *4QCant^b*, the absent verses contain a lyric description of the woman's breasts as well as the man's declared intent to spend the night making love to his bride (4:4-7). Moreover, the section omitted from *4QCant^a* contains a lengthy depiction of the wedding night consummation (4:8-5:1), an erotic dream filled with sexual euphemism (5:2-7), the "lost" lover enjoying the girl's sexual delights (6:1-2), and descriptive praise (*wasf*) of the woman's body (6:4-10). Assuming a connection between the scrolls and the site, the *Yahad*, in its dedication to purity and adherence to the Law, may have deemed this sensual material unfit for the righteous. Second, the curious absence of any citation of the *Song* in the other biblical and non-biblical scrolls could indicate an intentional avoidance of the book's erotica. (13) Finally, assuming

(11) Peter Flint, "The Book of Canticles (Song of Songs) in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *Perspectives on the Song of Songs* (ed. Anselm C. Hagedorn; BZAW 346; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2005), 101. In other works, this author repeats his claim, "Song of Songs was evidently a controversial, even disturbing book to many readers before the time of Jesus." James VanderKam and Peter Flint, *The Meaning of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: HarperCollins, 2002), 130; Martin C. Abegg, Jr., Peter Flint, and Eugene Ulrich, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Bible* (San Francisco: Harper Collins, 1999), 612.

(12) Marvin H. Pope, *Song of Songs* (AB 7C; Garden City: Doubleday, 1977), 26.

(13) Armin Lange, "The Status of the Biblical Texts in the Qumran Corpus and the Canonical Process," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (eds. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 23. Even among apocryphal and pseudepigraphal writings, citations or

a connection to the Essenes, their ideology and demographic may also support the intentional omission of graphic content. Pliny the Elder depicts the Essenes as “without women and renouncing love entirely” (*Nat.* 5.73). Philo adds, “They banned marriage at the same time as they ordered the practice of perfect continence. Indeed, no Essene takes a wife...” (*Hypoth.* 11.14). Moreover, Hippolytus similarly states, “They refrain from marriage... for in no way whatsoever have they confidence in women” (*Haer.* 9.18). Josephus also notes, “The Essenes renounce pleasure as an evil, and regard continence and resistance to the passions a virtue” (*J.W.* 2.120). (14) An absence of women may even be implicit in Qumran literature and archaeology. The *Community Rule* (1QS), regarded by many as the sect’s constitution, contains no references to marriage or sexual relations, even amidst its concern for purity. In addition, Magness and Zias conclude that, in contrast to similar sites in the region, the three (at best) female graves, one spindle whorl, and four beads indicate that a female presence at Qumran was very minimal. (15)

However, in spite of the above support posited for this explanation, much evidence weighs against its adoption. First, the ideology and demographic of the Qumran community is anything but clear. Although some Jewish and Greek writers characterize the Essenes exclusively as adult celibate men, which certainly reflects their own misogynic attitude and admiration for an ascetic, celibate lifestyle, (16) this portrait conflicts with many passages in the non-biblical scrolls. No mandate for celibacy is found in the Qumran writings. (17) In fact, the *Damascus Document* (CD) includes laws involving

allusions to *Song of Songs* are rare, mainly occurring in the later *Testament of Solomon*, from the 1st-3rd c. CE (*T Sol* 3:5, 22:1 [1:1]; *T Sim* 6:2 [2:1]; *1 En* 13:10 [4:8]; *3 En* 23:18 [4:16]; *T Sol* 26:1 [6:3]; *T Sol* 26:2 [6:12]; *T Sol* 26:2 [7:1]). Stone suggests an allusion to the adjuration refrain (2:7, 3:5, 8:4) in *4 Ezra* 4:37. Michael Stone, “The Interpretation of Song of Songs in *4 Ezra*,” *JSJ* 38:2 (2007): 230-33. However, this proposal, based on Latin manuscript evidence in an eschatological context, seems tentative at best. The content of *4 Ezra* seems closer to the historical allegory of *Targum Canticles* than the biblical text.

(14) Geza Vermes and Martin D. Goodman, eds., *The Essenes* (Sheffield: JSOT Press, 1989), 33, 39, 63.

(15) Jodi Magness, *The Archaeology of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2002), 163-78; Joseph E. Zias, “The Cemeteries of Qumran and Celibacy: Confusion Laid to Rest?,” *DSD* 7:2 (2000): 245-53. The spindle whorl is commonly depicted as a feminine object, evident in its connection with Athirat in the Baal Cycle (*KTU* 1.4 II:3-4) as well as Azatiwada’s portrait of peace/safety during his reign over Kartepe (*KAI* 26 A II:6).

(16) For the misogynic attitude of Philo and Josephus, see *Hypoth.* 11.14-17 and *J.W.* 2.121 respectively.

(17) Joseph M. Baumgarten, “Celibacy,” *EDSS*, 1:125; Elisha Qimron, “Celibacy in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Two Kinds of Sectararians,” in *The Madrid Qumran Congress: Proceedings of the International Congress on the Dead Sea Scrolls, Madrid 18-21 March 1991* (eds. J. Treballe Barrera and L. Vegas Montaner; STDJ 11; Leiden: Brill, 1991), 1:289.

sexual relations, menstrual purity, marriage, divorce, women, and children. Women were equally educated, admitted as members of the community, and allowed to give limited testimony. Moreover, the mention of "Mothers" seems to indicate that some women even held a senior, authoritative position. The *Rule of the Congregation* includes women in its description of messianic rule at the end of days, 4Q502 mentions a wife and offspring in the context of an enigmatic ritual celebration, the *War Scroll* acknowledges women and children, banning them from war camps, and the *Temple Scroll* contains legislation for marriage, sexual relations, childbirth, and purity laws. Women are also mentioned in other fragmentary legal and wisdom texts. (18)

On the matter of marriage, Josephus further qualifies his earlier characterization, noting that the Essenes "do not absolutely deny the fitness of marriage" (*J.W.* 2.121), even revealing the existence of married Essenes (*J.W.* 2.160-61). Thus, Collins proposes that "marrying Essenes were probably the norm, and celibate ones the exception." (19) Wassen similarly opines that celibacy "may have been a late development in a movement that increasingly turned sectarian" (1st c. CE). In fact, she argues that in contrast to the misogyny of Jewish and Roman writers, the early legal stratum of *CD* improved a woman's position in the community as compared to biblical law. (20) Thus, as Loader concludes in his work on sexuality in the scrolls, "The writers of the scrolls which have survived did not see fit to give [celibacy] emphasis and certainly did not indicate that its basis was discomfort with, or an aversion in relation to, matters of sexuality." (21)

(18) Linda Bennett Elder, "The Woman Question and Female Ascetics among Essenes," *BA* 57:4 (1994): 225-32; Eileen M. Schuller, "Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Dead Sea Scrolls After Fifty Years: A Comprehensive Assessment* (eds. P. Flint and J. VanderKam; Leiden: Brill, 1999), 123-39; Sidnie White Crawford, "Not According to Rule: Women, the Dead Sea Scrolls, and Qumran," in *Emanuel: Studies in Hebrew Bible, Septuagint, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honor of Emanuel Tov* (eds. S. M. Paul, et al.; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 130-40; Moshe Bernstein, "Women and Children in Legal and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," *DSD* 11:2 (2004): 198-211. Of the six texts normally used to support celibacy, 4Q184 can be regarded akin to proverbial injunctions to avoid the Strange Woman (*Prov* 7), 1QM 7.4-7 applies to sexual impurity within the war camp, similar to the Levitical purity laws, and the other texts could easily be explained as admonitions to avoid pre-/extra-marital sex, not all sexual relations (*IQS* 1.6, 4.9-10; *CD* 2.16, 4.15-18).

(19) John J. Collins, "Family Life," *EDSS*, 1:288. 4QpapRitMar (4Q502) also "challenges the conventional views of the Qumran community as an all-male celibate order." Esther G. Chazon, "Psalms, Hymns, and Prayers," *EDSS*, 2:711.

(20) Cecilia Wassen, *Women in the Damascus Document* (ACBI 21; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2005), 207-08.

(21) William Loader, *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes Toward Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009), 389.

In addition to these conflicting portraits in the non-biblical scrolls (women absent in *IQS* but present in others), the material evidence and cemetery remains are also inconclusive. First, though many scholars have noted the lack of female gendered objects (combs, jewelry, etc.) among the material evidence from Qumran, this absence may be attributed to an ascetic disinterest in the physical appearance. Second, though de Vaux deduced, based mainly on 43 excavated graves (out of 1200 total), that “women were not members of the community, or at any rate not in the same sense as the men buried in the main cemetery,” (22) recent studies have cast a shadow of doubt on this consensus theory. In their latest analysis of the burial evidence from the French collection, Sheridan and Ullinger aptly summarize the problem with any conclusions based on the cemetery:

About all that can be said with confidence is that our analysis of the remains in Paris and Jerusalem indicate a preponderance of adult men. However, one cannot propose this age or sex profile as a community *pattern*. A questionable excavation plan, an exceptionally unrepresentative sample size, poor preservation, Vallois’ claim of up to six possible women among the Paris remains, and incomplete exhumation are but a few of the features complicating analysis of this collection beyond ‘reasonable doubt.’ (23)

While the lack of evidence for women at Qumran briefly discussed above is an impressive argument from silence, and perhaps more will be known with the final publication of de Vaux’s excavation report and/or further excavation in the cemetery, this is certainly not enough to singlehandedly support the theory that these two *Canticles* manuscripts were censored by Qumran celibates.

Second, this proposed motivation for abbreviating the *Song* to avoid graphic content also does not align with the internal evidence. Censorship of 4:4-7 in *4QCant^b* is difficult to explain in light of the presence of these verses in *4QCant^a*. Moreover, while some of the omitted text is erotic (i.e., 4:4-7), other verses contain no sensual material (3:6-8, 5:8-16). 5:8-16 may have been excluded in light of the erotica in the context (4:8-5:7; 6:1-10), but the omission of 3:6-8 presents problems. These verses depict a royal wedding procession with no sexual content. Furthermore, in contrast to this non-sexual

(22) Roland de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (London: Oxford University Press, 1973), 129.

(23) Susan Guise Sheridan and Jaime Ullinger, “A Reconsideration of the Human Remains in the French Collection from Qumran,” in *The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates* (eds. Katharina Galor, Jean-Baptiste Humbert, and Jürgen Zangenberg; STDJ 57; Leiden: Brill, 2006), 212. In his review of all the cemetery evidence, Baumgarten counts four positively identified female burials, with three additional sets of remains as possibly female. Albert Baumgarten, “Who Cares and Why Does it Matter? Qumran and the Essenes, Once Again!,” *DSD* 11.2 (2004): 185.

material omitted from these scrolls, other sections included by the scribes contain the most explicit lyrics of the book. (24) *4QCant^a* contains both *wasf* songs, in which the man describes the beauty of the woman's body (4:1-6, 7:1-7), and *4QCant^b* includes the beginning of the first *wasf* song (4:1-3) as well as a poetic depiction of consummation (4:14-5:1).

Third, the theory that certain passages were omitted from manuscripts of *Song of Songs* due to their explicit nature also conflicts with multiple selections in the non-biblical scrolls. The most obvious example of a text from the Qumran corpus with sexual content is *4QWiles of the Wicked Woman (4Q184)*. Though not as explicit as Allegro suggested in the original publication, (25) nor as sensual as parallel passages concerning the Strange Woman of *Proverbs* 1-9, *4Q184* does contain erotic elements, specifically lines 12-14, "In the city squares she veils herself, and in the gates of the village she stations herself, and there is no one who can ke[ep her] from (her) incessant [fornicat]ing. Her eyes scan hither and thither, and she raises her eyes wantonly, to spot a just ma[n] and overtake him, and a [no]ble man, to trip him up...." (26) While the woman in *4Q184* is certainly depicted as immoral and sexually active, (27) the inclusion of this text in the scrolls could be justified in light of the abovementioned parallel with biblical wisdom literature.

However, Qumran literature also contains another more explicit text with closer connection to *Canticles*. Previously known in Greek, Latin, and Syriac versions of Sirach, as well as medieval Hebrew copies of *Ben Sira* from the Cairo Geniza (51:13-30), this interesting composition is located at the conclusion of the *Great Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a)*. Clearly represented as a distinct work by its separation from the previous and following texts, columns 21-22 of *11QPs^a* preserve this canticle:

- (11) When I was still young, before I had gone astray, I searched for her. She came to me in her beauty, and up to
- (12) the end I kept investigating her. Even when the blossom falls, when the grapes are ripening, they make the heart happy.
- (13) My foot tread on a straight path, for since my youth I have known her. I had hardly bent
- (14) my ear, when I found much teaching. She became a nurse to me, to my teacher I give

(24) Longman agrees, labeling this explanation "unlikely, considering that the scroll contains other passages that are more than a little sensuous." Tremper Longman III, *Song of Songs* (NICOT; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2001), 20.

(25) J.M. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4.I (4Q158-4Q186)* (DJD V; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1968), 82-85.

(26) Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition* (Leiden: Brill, 1997), 1:377.

(27) Matthew J. Goff, *Discerning Wisdom: The Sapiential Literature of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 106-11.

- (15) my honor. I determined to 'make sport.' I was zealous for good, incessantly. I became ablaze
- (16) for her, I could not av[e]rt my face. I stirred my soul for her and on her heights I was not
- (17) calm. I opened my 'hand' [...] and perceived her nakedness. I cleansed my 'hand'... (28)

The linguistic and conceptual parallels between these verses and one of the passages omitted from *4Q Cant^b* present major problems for this pious rationale. Scholars have long noted that *Song of Songs* 5:2-7, the maiden's nightmare of losing her lover, includes erotic euphemism, "My lover thrust his 'hand' through the 'hole,' and my inward parts were stirred for him" (5:4). While יד can refer to a physical hand, it is also used to describe a man's genitals, both in Hebrew (*Isa* 57:8; *IQS* 7.13, *11QT* 46:13) and Ugaritic (*KTU* 1.23.33-35). In her dream, the maiden prepares to make love and engages in the sexual act as well. (29) The Greek translator of *Ben Sira* confirms that the erotic nature of this imagery dramatizing the pursuit of wisdom was evident to the ancients, substituting non-sensual language (lms 16-17), "I directed my soul toward her, and in my deeds I was exact. I stretched my hands on high and perceived her secrets" (*Sirach* 51:21-22). Muraoka aptly summarizes the potential problem for a righteous community, "One can hardly deny that, given the right mood, some of the touchy, perilously ambiguous and suggestive expressions in it could have aroused in the minds of celibate Qumran members perhaps unintended sensual images." (30)

Finally, although the scrolls from Qumran lack any citation from the *Song*, there is one text which contains similar motifs and language. In *Genesis Apocryphon XX (IQapGen ar)*, Pharaoh's emissary Hyrcanos paints an erotic portrait of Sarai, praising her unparalleled physical beauty:

- (2) How [splendid] and beautiful is the shape of her face, and how
- (3) [lo]vely and how smooth the hair of head! How lovely are her eyes; how pleasant her nose and all the radiance

(28) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 2:1175; James A. Sanders, *The Psalms Scroll of Qumran Cave 11 (11QPs^a)* (DJD IV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1965), 81.

(29) M. Delcor, "Two Special Meanings of the Word יד in Biblical Hebrew," *JSS* 12:2 (1967): 234-40; Gary Rendsburg, "Word Play in Biblical Hebrew: An Eclectic Collection," in *Puns and Pundits: Word Play in the Hebrew Bible and Ancient Near Eastern Literature* (ed. S. B. Noegel; Bethesda, MD: CDL Press, 2000), 153-54.

(30) T. Muraoka, "Sir. 51, 13-30: An Erotic Hymn to Wisdom?," *JSJ* 10:2 (1979): 175. Recently Reymond, who opposes an extremely erotic interpretation, concluded "The erotic dimension of some words and phrases cannot be denied [noting *Cant* 5:2-4]; nor should the poem's implicit analogy between sexual desire and desire for Wisdom be totally obscured." Eric D. Reymond, "Sirach 51:13-30 and 11Q5 (=11QPs^a) 21.11-22.1," *RevQ* 23/2 (2007): 210.

- (4) of her face... How fair are her breasts and how lovely all her whiteness! How beautiful are her arms! And her hands, how
- (5) perfect! How alluring is the whole appearance of her hands! How pretty are the palms of her hands and how long and supple all the fingers of her hands! Her feet,
- (6) how lovely! How perfect her thighs! No virgin or wife who enters the bridal chamber is more beautiful than her. Above all
- (7) women her beauty stands out; her loveliness is far above them all. And with all this beauty there is in her great wisdom. And everything she does with her hands
- (8) is perfect. (31)

While *Canticles* includes more elaborate, metaphoric depictions, *Genesis Apocryphon* contains phrases and motifs that parallel the *Song*'s language, specifically the two *wasf* songs in which the man praises the maiden's appearance from head to foot (4:1-7; 7:1-7 foot-head) as well as her matchless beauty (6:8-9). (32) For our interest, "the author of the poem not only describes Sarai's beautiful face and slender fingers but also praises parts of a woman's body usually covered, such as her breasts and thighs, and imagines her being led to the marriage chamber." (33) In addition to this sensual depiction of Sarai, *Genesis Apocryphon* also records the sexual pleasure of Bitenosh, mother of Noah (20.9-10). If the *Canticles* manuscripts were intentionally abbreviated to censor sexual content, why did the scribe(s) leave erotic material elsewhere in the *Song* and include sensuous passages in the *Great Psalms Scroll* (11QPs^a) and *Genesis Apocryphon*? (34) Thus, this proposed explanation is doubtful, as it raises more questions than answers.

(31) García Martínez and Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Study Edition*, 1:41.

(32) M. H. Goshen-Gottstein, "Philologische Miscellen zu den Qumrantexten," *RevQ* 2/5 (1959): 46-48. An additional parallel between *Genesis Apocryphon* and *Canticles* may be found in the comparison of Sarai with a date-palm (1QapGen ar XIX; *Song* 7:7-8), though Fitzmyer notes that cedar-palm tree couplet may allude to *Psalms* 92:13. Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave 1* (1Q20) (3rd ed.; BibOr 18b; Rome: Editrice Pontificio Instituto Biblico, 2004), 185. Rather than similar motifs, Nunnally proposes allusions to the *Song* from Qumran, apocrypha, pseudepigrapha, and rabbinic literature, concluding that *Song of Songs* was composed and canonized earlier than modern scholars accept, and that its allegorical and literal interpretation coexisted for a long period prior to Aqiba. W. E. Nunnally, "Early Jewish Interpretation, Use, and Canonization of Song of Songs," in *The History of Interpretation of Song of Songs* (ed. Paul Raabe; St. Louis: Concordia Press, Forthcoming). However, much of this supposed reuse are epithets and images which can easily be attributed to the genre of love poetry attested throughout the ancient Near East.

(33) Lawrence H. Schiffman, *Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls* (New York: Doubleday, 1995), 142.

(34) 11QPs^a and 1QapGen are dated to the late 1st c. BCE and early 1st c. CE respectively, the same period as the paleographic dating of the *Canticles* fragments. Peter W. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms* (STDJ 17; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 49; Fitzmyer, *Genesis Apocryphon*, 25-26.

Similar Content

The editor of the *Canticles* fragments posits another explanation for the abbreviation of these texts, specifically *4QCant^a*, “The similar content of the text before and after the break may have been related to the shortening of the text. In the sections juxtaposed in *4QCant^a* several identical parts of the body are described and identical motifs are used: pomegranates (4:3; 6:11), breasts, twins (4:5=7:4), neck (4:4; 7:5), eyes (4:1; 7:5), and tower (4:4; 7:5). The similarity may have brought about the present juxtaposition of the sections.” (35) At first glance, this rationale seems to hold promise, as the material in 4:1-7 is akin to 6:11-7:7. However, the continuation of his theory surfaces the major problem, “At the same time, one notes the closeness in content between 4:1-3 (included) and 6:5-7 (excluded); in this case, similarity of content might have been a reason for excluding the material.” (36) While the excluded description in 6:5b-7 is almost a verbatim repetition of 4:1b-2, 3b, the depiction of the woman’s neck and breasts in 4:4-5 are strikingly similar to the portrait included in 7:3-4. Why is the similarity of one set of passages regarded as the reason for omission yet the other the rationale for juxtaposition? Tov presents *4QPsⁿ* as parallel, in which the scribe moved from 135:12 to 136:22 based on the repetition of a phrase, yet this immediate linguistic connection is not present in either of the *Canticles* fragments. (37) Flint also suggests this reason for omission in *4QCant^b*, “One possible reason for the second omission (4:4-7) is the parallels between descriptions of the female body in this chapter and in chapter 6.” (38) However, such a theory is based on non-extant material since this manuscript appears to have ended at 5:1. While the repetition of forms and motifs throughout the *Song* makes this proposed explanation appealing, the short nature of this book and the differing types of material included and excluded from the two fragments poses problems for this theory.

Different Literary Edition(s)

The common approach of the above positions assumes that a scribe(s), despite knowing the canonical form, intentionally omitted certain verses. Hess reflects this viewpoint, concluding that these fragments served “another intent distinct from the preservation of the *Song* itself.” (39) Tov, editor of the *Canticles* fragments, acknowl-

(35) Tov, “Canticles,” 203; idem, “Three Manuscripts of Canticles,” 97.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Emanuel Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts from Qumran,” *RevQ* 16/64 (1995): 592.

(38) Flint, “The Book of Canticles,” 101.

(39) Richard S. Hess, *Song of Songs* (BCOTWP; Grand Rapids: Baker, 2005), 21.

edges yet rejects the probability that these manuscripts reflect a different textual tradition, “Underlying this description [of 4QCant^{a,b}] is thus the understanding that the Qumran scrolls shortened an earlier existing text, while the assumption that they represented early literary crystallizations of the book differing from the one represented by the other textual witnesses, though not impossible, is disregarded.” (40) Ulrich criticizes this assumption, “Is there any other reason, other than our familiarity with the order in the Masoretic edition of the Song, to start from the position that the MT edition was the only real edition, and then conclude that any other arrangement of the Song is therefore not a biblical manuscript but a post-biblical adaptation?” The missing poetic units could have appeared elsewhere in the scroll, or they could have been absent entirely, as Ulrich notes. The first case would be analogous to the rearranged book of *Jeremiah* (4QJer^{b,d}-LXX vs. 4QJer^{a,c}-MT), and in the second case, parallels could be drawn to the longer and shorter forms of *Daniel* (1QDan^{a,b}, 4QDan^{a-d}, 6QDan-MT vs. LXX). (41) This explanation may also be supported by parallels in 4QJudg^a and the *Psalms* manuscripts from Qumran. Treballe Barrera asserted that the omission of Judg 3:7-10 from 4QJudg^a signaled an earlier edition, prior to this secondary Deuteronomistic insertion. (42) Similarly, Sanders and Flint claim that the *Psalms* scrolls, especially 11QPs^a demonstrate progressive stabilization of this book’s canonical form as well as the presence of multiple editions whose order diverges from the MT. (43) However, these parallels from *Judges* and *Psalms* have been contested by other scholars.

Recently, Ulrich reiterated his position, “[4QCant^{a,b}] could be ‘abbreviated MSS,’ or, more likely, they could be simply variant liter-

(40) Tov, “Canticles,” 196; idem, “Three Manuscripts of Canticles,” 89.

(41) Eugene C. Ulrich, “The Qumran Scrolls and the Biblical Text,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Fifty Years After Their Discovery* (eds. L. H. Schiffman, E. Tov, and J. C. VanderKam; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2000), 58.

(42) Julio Treballe Barrera, “4QJudg^a,” in *Qumran 4.IX: Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Kings* (eds. Eugene Ulrich, et al.; DJD XIV; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1995), 161-64. Hess cautions against such far-reaching conclusions from a small fragmentary text, and Fernández Marcos also concludes that sufficient textual evidence does not exist to posit two editions of the book of *Judges*. Richard S. Hess, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and Higher Criticism of the Hebrew Bible: The Case of 4QJudg^a,” in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 22-28; Natalio Fernández Marcos, “The Hebrew and Greek Text of *Judges*,” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 25; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 1-16.

(43) James A. Sanders, “Variorum in the Psalms Scroll (11QPs^a),” *HTR* 59:1 (1966): 90. After addressing arguments from Talmon, Goshen-Gottstein, and Skehan against Sanders, Flint concludes that 11QPs^a should be considered a canonical work. Flint, *The Dead Sea Psalms Scrolls and the Book of Psalms*, 202-27.

any editions of the Song, similar to the many other instances of variant literary editions of biblical books.” (44) Yet, despite criticizing Tov’s disregard for the possibility that the *Canticles* manuscripts could reflect a different textual tradition, Ulrich presents little solid evidence to support the likelihood of his own theory. One problem with proposing parallels in the two editions of *Jeremiah* and *Daniel* is a difference in evidence. For these two books, the variant was already known from the Septuagint, with the Qumran scrolls merely confirming the coexistence of different textual traditions. Whereas in the case of *Canticles*, the content and order of poetic units finds united agreement in the MT, LXX, Syriac, Targum, and Vulgate. Moreover, as most scholars agree that the Old Greek translation of the *Song* was completed between the 1st c. BCE and 1st c. CE, (45) coinciding with the paleographic dating of the fragments from Qumran, the canonical form of the *Song* found in the MT and other versions certainly existed at this time. (46)

Second, the omission of different verses from each fragment further suggests that the whole text of *Canticles* was known. In fact, most verses omitted from 4*Cant*^b are found in 4*QCant*^{a,c} (except 3:6) and those absent from 4*QCant*^a are partially preserved in 4*QCant*^b (except 4:12-13, 5:2-6:10). If Ulrich’s theory of different textual traditions is accepted, the lack of agreement in 4*QCant*^{a,b} would imply a fluid text, appearing in multiple literary editions, unlike *Jeremiah* or *Daniel*. (47)

(44) Eugene Ulrich, “Our Sharper Focus on the Bible and Theology Thanks to the Dead Sea Scrolls,” *CBQ* 66:1 (2004): 8.

(45) Jay Curry Treat, “Lost Keys: Text and Interpretation in Old Greek Song of Songs and Its Earliest Manuscript Witnesses” (PhD diss., University of Pennsylvania, 1996), 383-84; Natalio Fernández Marcos, *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Version of the Bible* (trans. W. G. E. Watson; Leiden: Brill, 2000), 50; Karen H. Jobes and Moisés Silva, *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 2000), 34. Bickerman and Tov suggest that the Writings may have been translated in the 2nd c. BCE or earlier based on the reference to “Law, Prophets, and other books” in the *Ben Sira* prologue (116 BCE). Elias J Bickerman, “Some Notes on the Transmission of the Septuagint,” in *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (ed. Amram Tropper; Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity 68/1; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 1:144; Emanuel Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (2nd Rev. ed.; Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2001), 137.

(46) Strawn’s conclusion that Ulrich’s theory might be safer since Tov could be charged with anachronism (MT) misses the contemporaneous LXX evidence. Brent A. Strawn, “Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran: Their Significance for the Textual History of the Hebrew Bible and the Socio-Religious History of the Qumran Community and its Literature,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco, TX: Baylor University Press, 2006), 2:141, 58.

(47) In fact, some scholars view the biblical texts at Qumran not merely as evidence of text fluidity but also of late canon formation, even into the 1st- 2nd c. CE. Eugene C. Ulrich, “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hebrew Scriptural Texts,” in *The Bible and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. James H. Charlesworth; Waco: Baylor University Press, 2006), 1:97-99.

Lastly, the consistent non-conformance of abbreviated texts with the MT suggests that these manuscripts may have served another purpose, distinct from the transmission of the biblical text. In his work on this special collection, Tov makes the following conclusion, "The most striking feature of the excerpted and abbreviated texts is that, with the exception of some phylacteries and *mezuzot*, none of the collections is close to the MT. This indicates that these texts come from a certain milieu, one which differed from the circles fostering the tradition of the writing of Scriptural texts." (48) Thus, although the presence of different literary editions of the *Song* at Qumran is possible, the united agreement of the extant textual witnesses, the selective omission of different verses in each manuscript, and the consistent divergence in excerpted and abbreviated texts from the MT weighs against the probability that these fragments represent other textual traditions. (49)

Liturgical, Personal or Undetermined Use?

Therefore, if these abbreviated manuscripts served a purpose in the Qumran community different from the transmission of Scripture, the question remains as to their *raison d'être*. In his preliminary edition as well as the *editio princeps*, Tov posits that these manuscripts were used for liturgical purposes, based mainly on their similarity to other scrolls classified as liturgical texts. (50) First, the majority of excerpted/abbreviated texts either were *tefillin/mezuzot* or they contain a section of Scripture found elsewhere on Qumran phylacteries (4QExod^e, 4QDeut^{j,kl,n}, 5QDeut). (51) Second, the small dimension (height) of the *Canticles* fragments parallels these excerpted liturgical texts. In his work on scribal practices, Tov notes that the known copies of the Megilloth (except 4QQoh^a) as well as the excerpted and abbreviated texts are much smaller in size than the average biblical

(48) Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 599. Despite many changes in the classification of Qumran biblical texts, Tov reiterates this conclusion in his latest summary. Emanuel Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judaean Desert: An Overview and Analysis of the Published Texts," in *The Bible as Book: The Hebrew Bible and the Judaean Desert Discoveries* (eds. E. D. Herbert and E. Tov; New Castle, DE: Oak Knoll Press, 2002), 150.

(49) On the use of the Dead Sea scrolls for textual criticism, Williamson cautions of "the difficulty in particular of discerning the status of modest-sized fragments with specific variations from the MT, such as harmonization, added material and changes of order; were these ever regarded as scriptural, or should some be differently evaluated? H. G. M. Williamson, "Do We Need A New Bible? Reflections on the Proposed Oxford Hebrew Bible," *Bib* 90:2 (2009): 174.

(50) Tov, "Canticles," 198; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 91.

(51) Julie A. Duncan, "Excerpted Texts of Deuteronomy at Qumran," *RevQ* 18/69 (1997): 50. Tov also suggests that the *Psalms* scrolls, rather than being variant, pre-canonical editions, were anthologies used for liturgical purposes. Tov, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 592-93.

scroll from Qumran. (52) Connecting their size and function, Tov opines, "The small size of these scrolls facilitated easy transport, and probably implied liturgical use." (53)

However, this connection between the size of a scroll and its function must be questioned. Could not the size of a manuscript simply be governed by necessity, by the length of the selected text? (54) Discussing the technicalities of scribal writing, Tov notes a direct relationship between the height and length of a manuscript, similar to the later scribal guidelines reflected in the Talmud (*b. B. Bat.* 14a), "Longer compositions were written in scrolls of greater dimensions, visible both in the height of the columns and the length of the scroll." (55) Thus, if longer texts were copied on larger scrolls with bigger writing blocks and taller columns, one can assume that shorter texts would be copied on small scrolls with smaller writing blocks and shorter columns. While various attempts have been made to connect small scrolls to liturgy, this connection should be regarded as a secondary phenomenon resulting from the fact that liturgical texts are shorter in nature, so less parchment or leather was needed. Why use a large scroll to copy a short text? This functional explanation aligns with the attested scribal practice in selecting writing materials, as Tov observes, "The leather used for biblical texts was not of better quality than the leather used for nonbiblical compositions, and *tefillin* and *mezuzot* were often written on leftovers of ragged shapes." (56)

It should also be noted that some scrolls with a small writing block were likely not used in liturgy, (e.g., *4QBirth of Noah*^{b,c}; *4QCal. Document A, B, D*; *4QZodiacology and Brontology*; *4QToh A*; *4QS^{b,d,f,j}*; *4QMMT^{c,f}*; *4QM^c*; *4QPs.Jub^a*; *4QGen^s*; *4Qpls^{a,b}*; *4QpNah*; *4QDan^e*; *4QEzek^a*), while other scrolls with a large writing block were likely used in worship (*4QShirShabb^d*; *4QTest*; *4QPs^{a,c,e,q}*; *11QPs^a*). This practical explanation is further supported by two cop-

(52) Emanuel Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54; Leiden: Brill, 2004), 90.

(53) Tov, "Canticles," 198; idem, "Three Manuscripts of Canticles," 91. Elsewhere Tov similarly states, "In the case of the Qumran scrolls, it was probably their liturgical character which dictated the small, and hence more practical dimensions of the scrolls." idem, "Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts," 596. In his latest inventory of biblical texts, Tov also notes scroll size as a distinguishing factor, "Doubts about the unconventional character of the [excerpted and abbreviated] scrolls has been raised because of the small size of the scrolls" Idem, *Revised Lists of the Texts from the Judean Desert* (Leiden: Brill, 2010), 112.

(54) Thanks to my colleague Carl Pace for suggesting this functional explanation and alerting me to a parallel in *4Q298 The Maskil's Address to the All Sons of Dawn*, which will be discussed in the concluding section.

(55) Emanuel Tov, "The Dimensions of the Qumran Scrolls," *DSD* 5:1 (1998): 70; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 75.

(56) Emanuel Tov, "The Writing of Ancient Biblical Texts, with Special Attention to the Judean Desert Scrolls," in *Sefer Moshe: Studies in the Bible and the Ancient Near East, Qumran, and Post-Biblical Judaism* (eds. C. Cohen, A. Hurvitz, and S. M. Paul; Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2004), 446.

ies of the *Hodayot* scroll, *IQH*^a with its very large writing block and *4QH*^c, an excerpted copy with a small writing block. (57) Therefore, a proposed correlation between scroll size and function in the community, although initially promising, cannot explain the full scope of evidence in Qumran literature.

Despite having postulated a liturgical function for the *Canticles* manuscripts in his early publications, Tov subsequently altered his opinion in later works. In his analysis of excerpted and abbreviated biblical texts, *4QCant*^{a,b} are categorized as abbreviated versions for private reading, “probably reflecting the excerptors’ literary taste.” (58) Similarly, in the second edition of his work on textual criticism, Tov opines, “Many Qumran texts arrange the biblical text differently or omit sections, especially of the Psalms. These texts have been presented as excerpted or abbreviated texts, mainly for liturgical purposes, or, in the case of *4QCant*^{a,b}, as personal copies.” (59)

Similar to the preceding position, the main evidence for this proposed function of *4QCant*^{a,b} is also based on other excerpted texts, both their size and contents. Schuller suggests that the small size of certain manuscripts might signal their use in private reading or meditation. From the non-biblical scrolls, she mentions the *Words of the Luminaries* [*4Q504*], the *Hodayot* [*4Q429*], and *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* [*4QShir*^a]. (60) Among the biblical texts, Schuller and Tov list *4QPs*^{g,h} and *5QPs*, which likely contained only *Ps.* 119, and Tov adds *4QExod*^d (13:15-16, 15:1), *4QDeut*^q (32:37-43), *4QPs*^l (104), *4QPs*ⁿ (135:6-8, 11-12; 136:23-24), *4QEzek*^a (10:5-15; 10:17-11:11; 23:14-18, 44-47; 41:3-6), and *4QDan*^e (9:12-17). (61) Also, Tov suggests that the “free approach to Scripture” in several of these texts as well as the multiple scribal errors and Aramaic influence in *4QCant*^b may indicate that they were prepared for personal use. (62) Yet, the connection between scroll size and function, as demonstrated above is problematic. Secondly, although the *Exodus*, *Deuteronomy*, and *Psalms* fragments are identified as personal copies in light of their contrast to *tefillin/mezuzot* or larger liturgical anthologies, *4QCant*^{a,b} cannot be labeled as personal copies without assumptions regarding the nature of this community and its probable use of this biblical book.

(57) Tov, *Scribal Practices*, 84-89.

(58) Emanuel Tov, “Rewritten Bible Compositions and Biblical Manuscripts, with Special Attention to the Samaritan Pentateuch,” *DSD* 5:3 (1998): 336-37; idem, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 591.

(59) Tov, *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 346.

(60) Eileen M. Schuller, “Some Reflections on the Function and Use of Poetic Texts Among the Dead Sea Scrolls,” in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. E. G. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 184.

(61) Emanuel Tov, “The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences between the LXX and MT S T V, Compared with Similar Evidence in Other Sources,” in *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship Between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered* (ed. Adrian Schenker; SBLSCS 25; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2003), 136-37.

(62) Tov, “Excerpted and Abbreviated Biblical Texts,” 600.

Furthermore, in his recent publications on the biblical scrolls from Qumran, Tov's ideas on the fragments of *Canticles* appear to show further development. As discussed above, *4QCant^{a,b}* were originally labeled as abbreviated manuscripts, likely for liturgical purposes. Then, as the classification changed from liturgical to personal copies, a hint of reservation begins to appear, "Most excerpted texts were probably made for liturgical purposes.... The same pertains to a few manuscripts containing abbreviated texts, *but the evidence for such texts is far from clear*." (63) Finally, Tov's latest work on this topic refrains entirely from classifying the function of these fragments. In his revised survey of the biblical texts from the Judean Desert, the excerpted texts (e.g., *tefillin*, several manuscripts of *Exodus* and *Deuteronomy*, and some *Psalms* texts) are still categorized as liturgical, but any proposed function for the abbreviated texts (*4QCant^{a,b}*, *4QExod^d*, *4QGen^d*, *4QDeut^{j,n,q}*, *4QEzek^a*, *4QPs^g*, *4QDan^e*) is curiously absent. (64) This abstention from offering any purpose particularly for the *Canticles* manuscripts is evident in the following classification, moving from liturgical to personal copies, without placing *Canticles* in either category:

The Deuteronomy texts were probably liturgical excerpts. Likewise, several Psalms texts are considered by most scholars to be non-biblical liturgical collections.... The Canticles manuscripts are probably excerpted versions of the edition of MT LXX S T V. The Qumran corpus also contains excerpted and abbreviated biblical manuscripts which were probably compiled for personal purposes.... (65)

Limitations & Implications for Interpretation

While the omission of verses from the *Canticles* fragments is clear enough, the reason for such abbreviation remains a mystery. In summary of the above theories, a censorship of sensual images conflicts with erotica elsewhere in the *Song* as well as numerous non-biblical scrolls. An avoidance of similar content cannot adequately explain the types of material included and excluded in the different fragments. The selective omission of different verses, the consistent divergence from the MT in excerpted/abbreviated texts, and a probable knowledge of the canonical form during this period weigh against a different textual tradition. And while the final two proposals, liturgy and private reading, are possible, both with parallels among other excerpted/abbreviated texts, neither can be justified simply by similarity of size, and the notion of personal copies requires

(63) Emanuel Tov, "Scriptures: Texts," *EDSS*, 2:835. [italics mine]

(64) Tov, "The Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert," 149-50; idem, *Scribal Practices*, 90.

(65) Tov, "The Nature of the Large-Scale Differences," 136. For space, the list of texts was omitted in the quote.

assumptions about the community and its probable use of *Canticles*. In addition, two other theories, equally speculative, should be considered. If 4Q502 is accepted as a marriage ritual, (66) 4QCant^{a,b} may have been used as wedding songs. Also, the scribal errors, Aramaisms, and general imprecision of 4QCant^b could indicate that this scroll was a school text, copied by a scribe in training. (67)

In light of this uncertain evidence for the function and interpretation of 4QCant^{a,b}, the additional speculation which continues to be built on top of such unproven theories is all the more surprising. In his publication of 4Q298, Pfann also connects scroll size and function, suggesting that the unusually small height of this scroll places it among the portable scrolls, which were owned by individuals and were intended to be carried and read during feasts or carried for a distance and concealed. (68) Yet, as discussed above, the height of a scroll was likely governed by its length, larger scrolls for longer texts and smaller scrolls for shorter texts. Thus, the size of this manuscript may indicate nothing more than that the text was sufficiently short to warrant a shorter scroll.

Furthermore, Alexander cites Tov's theory on the liturgical function of 4QCant^{a,b} as a basis for additional claims, "This suggests that already in the first century BCE the book was being read allegorically, since it is hardly conceivable, given the religious outlook of the group behind the Scrolls, that they would have read the text literally." (69)

(66) In the *editio princeps*, Baillet concluded that 4Q502 was likely a marriage ritual, a joyous public ceremony with references to fertility and a couple with offspring. Maurice Baillet, "502. Rituel de Mariage," in *Qumran Grotte 4. III (4Q482-4Q520)* (DJD 7; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982), 81. Although many scholars have accepted this identification, a few alternatives have been proposed. Noting parallels to the popular Sukkot festival as well as Philo's Therapeutae and Christian monasticism, Baumgarten proposed that this text celebrated the entry of aged married couples into the celibate Qumran community. Joseph M. Baumgarten, "4Q502, Marriage or Golden Age Ritual?," *JJS* 34:2 (1983): 125-35. Satlow, based on the joyous celebration of fecundity and parallel terminology with 4Q503 49 and 4Q509 3, suggested an (unattested) New Year and harvest festival. Michael L. Satlow, "4Q502: A New Year Festival?," *DSD* 5:1 (1998): 59-68.

(67) Tov, "Canticles," 208. "The paleo-Hebrew letters in 4QCant^b, described elsewhere as possibly line-fillers, could also denote matters of special (sectarian) interest since their use as line-fillers is not consistent." idem, "Letters of the Cryptic A Script and Paleo-Hebrew Letters Used as Scribal Marks in Some Qumran Scrolls," *DSD* 2:3 (1995): 337. See also Ian Young, "Notes on the Language of 4QCant^b," *JJS* 52:1 (2001): 122-31.

(68) Stephen Pfann and Menahem Kister, "4QCryptA Words of the Maskil to All Sons of Dawn," in *Qumran Cave 4.XV: Sapiential Texts, Part 1* (eds. Torleif Elgvin, et al.; DJD XX; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997), 7; Stephen Pfann, "The Maskil's Address to All Sons of Dawn," *JQR* 85:2 (1994): 213. Tov alludes to collaboration with Pfann, as 4QCant^b and 4Q298 both contain examples of cryptic script. Tov, "Scribal Marks in Some Qumran Scrolls," 330 n.3.

(69) Philip S. Alexander, "The Song of Songs as Historical Allegory: Notes on the Development of an Exegetical Tradition," in *Targumic and Cognate Studies: Essays in Honour of Martin McNamara* (eds. K. J. Cathcart and M. Maher; JSOTSup 230; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1996), 15. In his commentary, Davila de-

Elsewhere, he speculated whether the woman's praise of the man's appearance in 5:10-16 may have been censored due to the Jewish interpretation of the male lover as God. (70) In addition to the limited evidence for reconstructing their communal worship, there is no evidence that *Canticles* was interpreted allegorically at Qumran. Also, the development in Tov's ideas weakens such a conclusion. In his essay on liturgy at Qumran, Sarason aptly summarizes the lesson here, "Speculation, however warranted, must be clearly labeled as such and not be allowed to slip into the realm of the demonstrated." (71)

Moreover, in a volume on the history of the *Song's* interpretation, Nunnally uses cumulative evidence from Second Temple period literature to support an early date for the canonization, liturgical use, and coexistence of the allegorical and literal interpretation of the *Song* as much as 350 years prior to Aqiba. (72) However, the conclusions of Tov and Alexander are cited as the major evidence for the allegorical and liturgical function of *Canticles* at Qumran. Also, much of the supposed reuse of the *Song* from the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha in place names, epithets, and metaphors can be explained as part of the cultural environment, either from travel or the well-attested genre of love literature. One reason for this proposed connection between the *Canticles* fragments and worship is likely the Jewish tradition of reading the *Song* on the eve of Passover, yet this tradition cannot be dated earlier than *Song of Songs Rabbah* (mid-6th c. CE), (73) or as late as *Massekhet Soferim* (8th c. CE). (74) Therefore, given the lack of certainty due to preservation and paucity of evidence, one must also guard against overstating the contribution of the Qumran fragments to the compositional history of the *Song*. (75)

Although the liturgical or personal use of 4QCant^{a,b} are admittedly possible, there is not enough internal or external evidence to

finer liturgical texts as those that "show evidence of composition for use in the ritual life of ancient Judaism, whether pertaining to the cycle of festivals and holy days, to daily prayer in various situations, to ceremonial purification, or to rites of passages such as marriage." James R. Davila, *Liturgical Works* (eds. M. G. Abegg, Jr. and P. W. Flint; ECDSS 6; Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2000), 2. Thus, with the inclusion of marriage, even if the classification of the *Canticles* fragments as liturgical texts is accepted, an allegorical interpretation of the book is not a necessary conclusion.

(70) John Jarick, "The Bible's 'Festival Scrolls' Among the Dead Sea Scrolls," in *The Scrolls and the Scriptures: Qumran Fifty Years After* (eds. S. E. Porter and C. A. Evans; JSPSup 26; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1997), 172.

(71) Richard S. Sarason, "Communal Prayer at Qumran and Among the Rabbis," in *Liturgical Perspectives: Prayer and Poetry in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (ed. Esther G. Chazon; STDJ 48; Leiden: Brill, 2003), 152.

(72) Nunnally, "Early Jewish Interpretation, Use, and Canonization of Song of Songs,"

(73) Benjamin Edidin Scolnic, "Why Do We Sing the Song of Songs on Passover?," *CJ* 48:4 (1996): 60.

(74) Philip S. Alexander, *Targum of Canticles* (ArBib 17A; Collegeville, MN: Liturgical Press, 2003), 53-54.

(75) Strawn, "Excerpted Manuscripts at Qumran," 142.

determine how these fragments functioned or how this biblical book was interpreted by the Qumran community. In addition, there may be options which have yet to be considered. Consequently, at the present, an abstention from classifying the function of the *Canticles* fragments from Qumran seems best. However, if one desires to advance this discussion further, barring the discovery of additional textual evidence, numerous questions must be considered. What criteria distinguish a biblical text used for liturgy or personal use? (76) What function would a liturgical or private copy of *Canticles* have served at Qumran? Can any conclusions be made regarding interpretation and use simply by the preservation of the biblical text, without commentary or citation? In addition to these internal questions, external factors must also be considered. Can the function of *Canticles* be determined without a consensus on the nature of the Qumran community? Can the abbreviated form of *4QCant^{a,b}* be attributed to a sectarian purpose similar to the *Rule of the Community*, *Damascus Document*, *Hodayot*, and *War Scroll* or a non-sectarian purpose like *Enoch* or *Instruction*? Schuller's comment on the use and function of poetic texts is applicable here, "Ultimately the determination of the use and function of the poetic corpus will not be resolved solely by analysis of the texts." She notes that attention must also be focused on the cultural milieu of the Second Temple period that would have shaped the author of the scrolls and the community that preserved them. (77) In summary, these fragments of *Canticles* from Qumran, with all the uncertainty and speculation regarding their function and interpretation, beautifully illustrate Saadia's metaphor for this important yet debated book, "Song of Songs is comparable to a lock whose key has been lost or a jewel beyond any valuation." (78)

Brian P. GAULT*

(76) The ambiguity of the "liturgical" label is also noted by Eileen M. Schuller, "Prayer, Hymnic, and Liturgical Texts from Qumran," in *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls* (eds. E. Ulrich and J. C. VanderKam; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press, 1994), 162-69.

(77) Schuller, "Some Reflections on the Function and Use of Poetic Texts Among the Dead Sea Scrolls," 189.

(78) Saadia ben Joseph, "Commentary on the Song of Songs," in *Five Scrolls*, in Judeo-Arabic (ed. Joseph Qafikh; Jerusalem: The Society for the Preservation of Yemenite Manuscripts, 1962), 26. Originally in Judeo-Arabic, Saadia's commentary on the Song, with a similar metaphor in the opening lines, is also preserved in a Hebrew translation. idem, "Commentary on the Song of Songs," in *Sefer Ge'on ha-Ge'onim*, in Hebrew (ed. S. A. Wertheimer; Jerusalem, 1925), 82.

*Author's Note: Thanks to John Kampen at Methodist Theological School of Ohio, Eileen Schuller at McMaster University, as well as Richard Sarason, Jason Kalman and my colleagues at Hebrew Union College-Jewish Institute of Religion for their constructive comments which have sharpened this paper. However, none of these individuals bear responsibility for any errors or limitations in the views expressed herein.

BETWEEN AKKADIAN *ṬUPŠARRŪTU* AND ARAMAIC ספר:

Some Notes on the Social Context of the Early Enochic Literature (1)

Summary

During the Persian and Hellenistic periods in Babylonia the cuneiform culture moved into the temple precincts to stay there until the extinction of cuneiform writing. The priestly groups of *āšipu*, or incantation priests, and *kalû*, or lamentation priests, became main bearers of cuneiform writing and culture, astronomy, astrology and mathematics included. The influence of Late Babylonian culture on Jewish tradition is palpable in the Enochic texts and in the *Visions of Levi* (= *VLev*, the so-called *Aramaic Levi Document*) in the following texts: Aramaic versions of the lexical lists (*VLev* 32a–36), lunar visibility periods (*4Q208* and *4Q209*), general characterization of Babylonian magic and divination (*1 En.* 8:3; *4Q201* frg. 1 iv; *4Q202* frg. 1 iii). The list of sciences taught by the Watchers in *1 En.* 8:3 closely corresponds to what we know today about the profession of the Babylonian *āšipu*. Such an influence together with the critical attitude towards the *āšipu* disguised as Watchers is most probably due to the Jewish appropriation of the Aramaic version of Babylonian scholarship; it is not certain how the appropriation occurred, although the intermediary of the Aramaic scribes, *sepīru*, might be assumed. There are no historical accounts to prove that the Jewish scribes in Babylonia were trained in the highly sophisticated and profoundly specialized areas of cuneiform scholarly literature.

(1) The present article concludes chapter one in my forthcoming monograph: *The Aramaic Astronomical Book from Qumran: Text, Translation and Commentary*. I would like to express my gratitude to the following Assyriologists who read the manuscript and made comments: Augustinus Ganto, Hermann Hunger, Werner R. Mayer, Marcel Sigrist, and Joan Westenholz. Needless to say, I bear all responsibility for opinions expressed in this article.

EARLY during the period of the Neo-Assyrian empire the use of Aramaic is well attested and Aramaic speakers were gradually absorbed into the structure of the Assyrian administration. (2) The Akkadian texts from that period make references to Aramaic letters (*egirtu armētu*), and Assyrian art often presented cuneiform scribes with stylus and tablet standing next to scribes holding pen and leather or papyrus. Aramaic was also used as the *lingua franca* in diplomatic correspondence and legal documents. With the rise of the Chaldean and then Persian empires the Aramaization of Babylonia continued and Aramaic was a language actually spoken there, although the use of cuneiform writing continued until the Arsacid period, with a strong Aramaic influence in vocabulary, syntax, and morphology on Late Babylonian. Cuneiform texts of the Chaldean period and later mention the *sepīru*, learned Aramaic scribes, who served as scribes, translators, and experts. (3) The Achaemenian rulers chose Aramaic as the language of chancery throughout their vast empire, from India to Egypt, and the use of Official Aramaic continued until the fall of the Persian empire. The available evidence suggests that the eastern dialect of Aramaic served as the basis for the Official Aramaic of the Achaemenian period. There are, however, few surviving Aramaic texts from Achaemenian Babylonia, which most probably results from the fragility of leather and papyrus used for writing purposes.

The cuneiform sources from the Achaemenid period provide additional information about the economic and religious situation in that period. (4) The Sumero-Akkadian literary tradition continued under the auspices of the Babylonian temples, which became the last

(2) For a short history of Aramaic with an overview of the Achaemenian period, see Greenfield 1985; cf. Naveh and Greenfield 1984.

(3) For the cuneiform evidence and functions of the *sepīru* in the late first millennium B.C., see Pearce 1999. Describing the situation in Hellenistic Uruk, McEwan (1981: 27–28) notes that “Clerical work was divided between two offices, the *tupšarru*, who was the cuneiform scribe, and the *sepīru* who wrote on parchment/papyrus. In Uruk the former was definitely of higher status often being a member of the priestly class, while the latter is never a member of one of the clans of Uruk.”

(4) For a survey of written sources available for the history of Babylonia under the later Achaemenids, see Cagni 1986, Kuhrt 1987; for southern Mesopotamia, see Driel 1987. Oelsner (2002) draws a general picture of Babylonian culture after the fall of the Neo-Babylonian empire until the extinction of cuneiform writing, while Dandamaev (1994: 234) presents traditions and innovations in the political and economic system of Achaemenid Mesopotamia and stresses the conservative character of Babylonian culture: “The Persian administration was not interested in the internal intellectual life of Babylonia, and local culture preserved its traditions. The Achaemenid period, particularly from the last quarter of the fifth century B.C., was the most creative time for Babylonian mathematical astronomy. But all its successes, as well as some changes in religious ideology, were due to internal native evolution. Babylonian culture, which had become conservative already many centuries before the Persian conquest, was not much affected by the cultures of other nations of the empire.”

refuge of cuneiform religion and culture until its extinction in the first centuries of the Christian era. In the course of the fifth century a new kind of “antiquarian theology” harking back to early tradition brought the sky god Anu and his consort Antu to prominence in Uruk, which caused a reorganization of the official Babylonian pantheon. Prosopographic evidence indicates that from around middle of the fifth century B.C. the theophoric names honoring Anu appear in large numbers, and the name of the god of the sky is practically ubiquitous in Uruk cuneiform texts. (5) At the same time new developments in the study of the sky occurred, which consisted in the development of highly sophisticated mathematical astronomy. (6) Additionally, in the course of the same fifth century the zodiac was invented and horoscopic astrology describing the situation of the stars at the birth of an individual came into existence. (7)

The activity of the scholars-scribes connected with the temple (8) was not restricted to computational astronomy, and texts based on observation of the sky are also well known. The astronomical diaries from Babylon are abundantly attested in the Persian, Seleucid and Arsacid periods, until the middle of the first century B.C., but the prosopographic evidence and the names of the scribes in the colophons are rare. The 1880-6-17 collection containing some 1800 tablets found in and around Marduk's temple Esangil is preserved in the British Museum, (9) and about seventy astronomical tablets have been published. Some colophons mention the names of the scribes that are descendants of Mušēzib whose family tree, as reconstructed by Oelsner (2000: 802–810), spans several generations, beginning with the sixth century B.C. Apart from the astronomical ephemerides,

(5) See Kuhrt 1987: 150–152; Beaulieu 2004: 313–317.

(6) There are indications that, beginning with the end of the sixth century B.C., a complex mathematical lunar theory developed in Persian period in Babylonia, and reached its fully developed form (system A and system B) in the Seleucid period, see Britton 1993.

(7) See Rochberg 1998: 1–16.

(8) The available limited information concerning the astronomers/astrologers in the late Persian, Seleucid, and Arsacid periods indicates that they operated within the organizational structure of Marduk's temple Esangil in Babylon and of Anu's temple Rēš in Uruk, see Rochberg, 1993: 31–36. Rochberg also argues that the same scribes produced astronomical and astrological texts, and that “there truly was no separation between astronomers on one hand and the scribes of the diaries and omens on the other” (p. 42). Beaulieu and Britton (1994) showed the connection between astrology and the temple in 6th-century Uruk, where lunar eclipse predictions induced the *kalū* priests to perform the playing of the kettledrum ritual at the gate of the Eanna temple in order to avert the evil announced by the eclipse. The same ritual took place at the gate of the Ebabbar temple at Larsa and was also caused by the prediction of an eclipse. The two cuneiform documents that describe the occurrence of the ritual are separated by three days only and suggest a conflict between the *kalū* priests who performed the ritual and the Eanna temple administration, which was probably caused by the fact that the eclipse did not occur.

(9) For the description of the collection, see Robson 2008: 220–221.

dated diaries, and *Epic of Gilgameš*, Mušēzib's sons owned tablets of the *Enūma Anu Enlil* series and MUL.APIN compendium. (10) Probably one of the last members of the family owned a literary text (BM 33491+33826) dated to 251 SE (61/60 B.C.), that is to the year to which is dated the latest astronomical diary.

The archaeological excavations at Uruk by a German team (1969–1972) unearthed a house successively occupied in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. by two scribal families: descendants of Šangû-Ninurta and sons of Ekur-zākir. (11) The colophons of the tablets indicate that the Šangû-Ninurtas left the house around 412 B.C., and some time later the Ekur-zākirs took possession of the property; the most recent dateable tablets stem from 322–300 B.C. The house yielded some 500 tablets and fragments, and around 180 of them can be associated with the Šangû-Ninurta family, and around 240 with the Ekur-zākirs. (12) The colophons unanimously witness that the scribes of both families were *āšipu* (13) or incantation priests (physicians and exorcists at the same time), who, as well as following the rules of their own profession, participated in cultic activities in the temple of Anu and Antu in Uruk, and received a prebend from the temple. (14) The library of the Šangû-Ninurta family was composed of physiognomic and diagnostic omens, medical prescriptions and incantations, rituals, magic, hymns, literature, lexical lists, *Enūma Anu Enlil*, terrestrial omens, extispicy, astronomy, astrology, and mathematics. Prescriptions, incantations, and rituals composed around thirty percent of the library, which corresponds to the main professional interest of the scribes.

The library of the Ekur-zākir family possesses metrological school exercises together with some mathematical tablets, while the composition of its content is similar to the library of the Šangû-Ninurtas. The major part of information comes from the share of the library that belonged to Iqīša, son of Ištar-šuma-ēreš, an *āšipu* of the Rēš temple at Uruk: celestial omens (*EAE*), terrestrial omens (*šumma ālu*, *šumma izbu*, medical diagnostics), commentaries, incantations, lexical tablets (vocabularies and synonyms), astronomical texts (ephemeris computed according to system A). (15) Iqīša also wrote

(10) For the overview of their scholarly activity as reflected in colophons, see Robson 2008: 223–225, and Oelsner 2000: 802–805.

(11) The cuneiform tablets discovered by the German archaeological expedition were subsequently published in *Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka*, see Hunger 1976; von Weiher 1983; von Weiher 1988; von Weiher 1993; von Weiher 1998.

(12) For an overview of the cuneiform libraries, see Oelsner 1993.

(13) The Akkadian term was logographically written LÚ.MAŠ.MAŠ, except for a few literary texts where the Akkadian reading *mašmāšu* occurs, cf. CAD A/2, *āšipu* f, 2'.

(14) See McEwan 1981: 23–24.

(15) For information about Iqīša and his literary activity, see Farber 1987; Oelsner 2000: 797–798.

astrological texts that coordinate months and dates with “regions” of zodiacal signs and magical procedures. His library also includes a tablet written by Iqīša himself that contains the monthly change in the length of daylight over the year with the use of the linear zigzag function; another text describes the movements and timings of the heavenly bodies over the year, and an instruction provides simple calculation rules for finding the date of the summer solstice beginning in 361 B.C. (16)

Iqīša bears also the title of the “enterer of the temple of Anu and Antu” (*ērib bīti* ^dAnu u Antu), but other members of the same family from the Seleucid period are called “scribe of the *Enūma Anu Enlil* (*ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil*). (17) The descendants of Sîn-lēqi-unninni, that described themselves as *kalû*, or lamentation priests, at Uruk also bore the title of *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil*, and produced tablets with mathematical astronomy. (18) The composition and appurtenance of scribal libraries discovered at Uruk suggest that, starting with the late Achaemenian period, the cuneiform culture and learning is intimately linked with the Babylonian temple, and the *āšipu*, originally not in the service of a temple, becomes a temple official. (19)

In the Seleucid and Arsacid periods the Babylonian temple continued to be the cultural locus of cuneiform tradition, astronomy and astrology included. (20) The scribes who identify themselves as *āšipu*, or sometimes *kalû*, bear the title *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil*, which links them with the name of the astrological series, and which is frequently found in the colophons of the tablets that contain mathematical astronomy. (21) The title was first used in the astrological

(16) See Hunger 1991.

(17) See McEwan 1981: 16: Anu-a ḥa-ušabši (99 S.E.) and Šamaš-e ṭir (118/9 S.E.).

(18) For the scribal activity of two scribes bearing the same name, Anu-belšunu, and belonging to the same family in Seleucid Uruk, see Pearce and Doty 2000; for the general description of the Sîn-lēqi-unninni family and its scribal activity, see Beaulieu 2000; cf. See McEwan 1981: 11–13, 15–16.

(19) See Sallaberger and Huber Vulliet 2003–2005: 620: “In der achämenid. bis parth. Spätzeit allerdings konzentriert sich die keilschriftliche Schriftkultur an den Tempeln, der *āšipu*, “Beschwörer”, wird in den Tempel integriert, die “Schreiber von Enūma Anu Enlil”, die Himmelsgelehrten, sind nun häufig *āšipu* oder *kalû*, “Klage-sänger”, oder unterstehen direkt dem Tempel. Hier kann man von einer Konzentration von Wissen beim Priestertum sprechen, die so zuvor nicht bestanden hat.”

(20) See Rochberg 1993: 33: “Either despite or because of the fact that Babylon was no longer the administrative or commercial center of Mesopotamia, the continuation of the Babylonian temple in most of its capacities remains one of the remarkable features of late Babylonian culture. Indeed, it would seem to be the single institution of Mesopotamian civilization that remained in this late period, and so was the sole carrier of cultural forms such as cuneiform writing, Babylonian cult, so called “cuneiform law”, and of course, astronomy and astrology.”

(21) See Neugebauer 1983: 1: 13–16. The colophons that contain the names of the priestly scribes from Uruk identify them as the *āšipu*, members of the Ekur-zākir family, and *kalû*, members of Sin-lēqi-unninni family. Concerning the relationship between Babylonian mathematical astronomy and astrology, cf. the comment by

reports in the Neo-Assyrian period but did not designate a separate professional group. (22) The Neo-Assyrian use of *tuṣṣarru* indicates that the scribes were experts in different types of divination, celestial divination included, and the literature of scholarly divination was referred to by the abstract noun *tuṣṣarrūtu*, with the exception of the extispicy series *bārūtu*. (23) In a similar way, the use of this title in the Seleucid period does not usually indicate a separate scribal group but is most often associated with the priestly classes of *āšipu* and *kalûs*. (24)

The analysis of cuneiform texts produced or copied by priestly families in the Seleucid period indicates that the scribes did not limit their interest to mathematical astronomy, but copied and produced astrological literature, which means that they conjoined the astronomical expertise with celestial divination. On the other hand, the available texts do not provide examples for the specific use of the *EAE* series in the context of the Babylonian temple. The astrological reports with the citations of the *EAE* excerpts sent by the Babylonian and Assyrian scholars to the Assyrian kings ceased to be used with the fall of the Neo-Assyrian empire, and a similar type of communi-

Swerdlow (1999: 14): “Whatever the sophistication of ancient mathematical astronomy, both Babylonian and Greek, and even though at its highest level it was a science practiced for its own sake and guided by the curiosity and ingenuity of its practitioners, there is no reason to doubt that its origins lie in celestial divination. There is no contradiction between an original astrological motivation and a later purely scientific development.”

(22) See Oppenheim 1969. A letter of a Babylonian *kalû*, Marduk-šāpi-zēri, to the Assyrian king presents a list of twenty scholars (*ummāni*) able for the service of the king, and each of them is an expert in a particular scholarly discipline: *tuṣṣarru* (astrologer/scribe), *bārû* (haruspex), *āšipu* (exorcist/magician/physician), *asû* (pharmacist), *kalû* (lamentation priest). The author of the letter notes that each of these twenty scribes is expert in more than one discipline and that their proficiency is based on the knowledge of extensive technical literature. For the text of the letter, see Parpola 1993: 120–124. The expertise of the *kalû* and *āšipu* in astronomy and astrology in Late Babylonian period certainly comes not as an innovation, but as a continuation of an intellectual tradition as attested in the Neo-Assyrian period; cf. Oppenheim 1975.

(23) See Oppenheim 1969: 99, and Rochberg’s (2000: 361) comment: “It appears that the profession ‘scribe’ (^{LÜ}A.BA = *tuṣṣarru*) applied generally to specialists in scholarly divination, both celestial and terrestrial (*šumma ālu* and *šumma izbu*), as well as the hemerological omens (*iqqur ipuš* and *inbu bēl arḫi*). These works constituted the literature of the scholarly field referred to by the abstract noun *tuṣṣarrūtu*. ... Celestial omens belonged to a classification of scholarship whose various aspects were divination (celestial and terrestrial), lamentation literature, lexical literature and commentaries.” Note that with the development of astronomy and astrology in the late Persian and Hellenistic periods, although the traditional series of extispicy was known and copied, the practice of *bārūtu* has declined, and the *bārû* (haruspex) is virtually unattested in texts coming from the Hellenistic period, see McEwan 1981: 15.

(24) For the definition of Babylonian priesthood, or temple personnel, and its function, see Sallaberger and Huber Vulliet 2003–2005: 617–620.

cation between the king and scholars with an influence on the political life was never brought to life again. The available material in cuneiform shows an active involvement of the *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil* in conducting astronomical observations and producing astronomical texts. A document (CT 49 144) from the Arsacid Babylon (193 S.E.) indicates that the EAE scribes were supported by the Marduk temple Esangil for carrying out astronomical observations with the purpose of writing diaries, preparing astronomical tables (ephemerides), and producing almanacs. This kind of astronomical works represent three types of astronomical activity characteristic of this period, that is observational and not tabular (diaries), computational and tabular (ephemerides), partly observational partly computational (almanacs). (25)

When analyzing the socio-religious situation in the late Persian, Hellenistic, and Arsacid periods the emerging picture indicates that the Babylonian scribal culture moved into the temple area to stay there until the extinction of the cuneiform. The scribes that cultivated scribal craft (*ṭupšarrūtu*) busied themselves with astronomy, astrology, and mathematics, and belonged to two priestly groups (*āšipu* and *kalū*) whose connection to the temple in the Late Babylonian period is well attested. It appears, however, that the *āšipu* were the most important group (26) which cultivated traditional scholarship linked with their profession together with literary texts, mathematics, mathematical astronomy, astrological knowledge, and other divinatory sciences, terrestrial divination included, as abundantly witnessed by the cuneiform libraries found at Uruk. (27) The *āšipu*'s medical profession necessitated the knowledge of incantations, magical and apotropaic rites, medical plants, (28) healing procedures, all of which

(25) See Sachs 1948; McEwan 1981: 18–21; Rochberg 2000: 370–375.

(26) Analyzing the cuneiform sources from Hellenistic Babylonia, McEwan (1981: 21) is convinced that “The *āšipu* would seem to have been the most important of these priest/experts during the Hellenistic period. For, although the astrologer was certainly important, we find the *āšipu* mentioned more often in documents from all centers of Hellenistic Babylonia. He represented an older stratum of Mesopotamian religion than the astrologer, who was to a certain extent still somewhat of a *nouveau arrivé*. Their functions, however, were more complementary than conflicting as can be seen from the fact that the same individual could have both titles.”

(27) The *āšipu* and *kalū*'s libraries from the Hellenistic period from Uruk show that their content corresponded to the professional preparation of each group and mostly did not overlap; cf. Oelsner 1993: 236: “Auch wenn man berücksichtigt, daß nur ein Bruchteil des einst Vorhandenen erhalten ist und neue Funde das gegenwärtig gewonnene Bild verändern können, ist einerseits das Überwiegen von Beschwörungen und medizinischer Fachliteratur, andererseits von Kultliedern und Ritualen sicher nicht zufällig.”

(28) When writing about the education of the *āšipu* in first-millennium B.C. Mesopotamia, Gesche (2001: 215) notes that “Nicht zu vergessen ist, daß ein *āšipu* (Beschwörer) sich mit Steinen und Pflanzen auskennen mußte. Tafeln aus der Steinbeschreibungsserie *abnu šikinšu* wurden ebenso von jungen Schreibern kopiert wie die Pflanzenliste *uruanna = maštaka*l.”

served the patient who had to be freed from his or her illness that might be caused by gods, ghosts, demons, or the power of an oath. (29) Medical diagnostic omens for the use of the *āšipu* formed an official series entitled “when the *āšipu* goes to the house of a sick person” (*enūma ana bīt marši āšipu illaku*), (30) and together with the *Šumma alamdimmū* (“If the form”) (31) series concerning physiognomic omens, other incantation series and magico-medical prescriptions formed the main part of the textual reference material of the medico-magical practitioner. (32)

The Jewish adoption of schematic astronomical/astrological material based on reworked texts from the cuneiform tradition is one of the multifaceted cultural interrelations between Jewish religious tradition and Babylonia. The *Visions of Levi* usually dated to (early)

(29) JoAnn Scurlock (2006: 1–159) provided a detailed description of the *āšipu*’s healing activity in the case of ghost-induced illnesses on the basis of medico-magical prescriptions from Mesopotamia that constitute the main bulk of her monograph (pp. 161–678). Scurlock describes symptoms of ghostly afflictions, time and place of performance of ritual cures, recitations (ritual oath formulae, prayers, addresses to relevant gods, references to ghost-induced problems), and healing proceedings (offerings, libations, figurines, ritual burial, ritual dispatch, magic encirclements, amulets, fumigants, bandages, salves, potions, washes, suppositories). Ritter (1965) suggested that the *āšipu* was only a magical expert, while another medical professional, the *asû*, should be paralleled with the modern physician who views and treats disease on empirical basis without a recourse to magic. Scurlock (1999), however, has convincingly argued that Ritter’s classification is incorrect; the cuneiform texts do not distinguish between a “rational” and “magical” type of medical treatment, and the *āšipu* was the only one who diagnosed complex illnesses and treated them with magical and pharmacological means. Scurlock labels the *āšipu* as a “physician, exorcist, conjurer, and magician,” while the *asû* is paralleled with the function of the modern pharmacist.

(30) The official divinatory series of *āšipūtu* was first edited by Labat 1951; tablets 15–33 of the series with an extensive commentary have been re-edited by Heeßel 2000. The series is also called *Sakikkū* (Sum. SA.GIG) “symptoms.”

(31) For the new edition of the text, see Böck 2000b. In a brief communication Böck (2000a) drew attention to an esoteric Babylonian commentary probably from the Persian period that correlates *šumma izbu*, *sakikkū*, and *alamdimmū*, three series that deal with the human body and the appearance of man, with zodiacal constellations of Aries, Taurus, and Orion. This short text indicates a speculative interrelation between astrology and medical and physiognomic literature; see comments of the “signs of the earth” in 4Q202 frg. 1 iii 4 (1 En. 8:3) below.

(32) The literature related to healing and exorcism is extensive and only partially studied; except for the divinatory series *Sakikkū* it also includes the following rituals and incantation series: against the magical power of the oath (*mamītu*): *Šurpu* (“Burning”; cf. Reiner 1958); against the black magic of sorcerers: *Maqlū* (“Combustion”); against *lamaštu* demons: *Lamaštu*; *Muššu’u* (“Rubbing”; Böck 2003); against demonic powers: *Utukkū lemnūtu*; exorcisms reserved for the king: *Bīt rimki* (“Bath-House”), *Bīt salā’ mē* (“House of Sprinkling of Water”), *Bīt mēseri* (House of Enclosure); rituals annulling the effects of evil portents: *Namburbū*; for an overview of the incantation series and bibliography, see Röllig 1990:62–63; for a list of exorcistic literature belonging to the curriculum of the *āšipu*, see KAR 44 edited and commented by Zimmern (1916: 204–229) and Bottéro (1985: 65–112); for a recent edition of KAR 44, see Geller 2000: 242–254.

Hellenistic period are influenced by Babylonian *Listenwissenschaft*, a basic tool in the education of the scribes in Mesopotamia in all periods of its history. (33) Both *VLev.* 32a–36 and most of the *AAB* represent the same literary style: short sentences with tabular numerical notations that find their origin in Babylonian scribal literature. The assimilation of Babylonian educational practices in the context of Jewish education is noteworthy, and points to the same cultural background that produced the *Aramaic Astronomical Book* (4Q208–4Q211). It should be noted that the liturgical and metrological education of Levi by Isaac is presented as “scribal craft, instruction, and wisdom” (ספר מוסר חוכמה) (*VLev.* 88, 90, 98) which Levitical scribal apprentices are supposed to study. It is probable that the same expression stands behind the Ethiopic text in *Jub.* 4:17, where Enoch learns scribal craft, instruction, and wisdom as the first man on earth. (34) In this context it is perhaps not a mere coincidence that Levi praises the Lord of heavens (*VLev.* 13), an expression that might appear on the lips of Enoch to whom the heavenly knowledge has been revealed.

The Jewish assimilation of some parts of Babylonian scribal knowledge vested in Aramaic garb, whether related to lexical texts or astronomical/astrological literature, (35) inevitably led to the ques-

(33) See Drawnel 2004: 280–293. The transmission of (Sumero-)Akkadian lexical lists into Aramaic is indirectly attested in Pahlavi. Ebeling has proved that the Pahlavi ideograms in *Frahang-I-Pahlavik* go back to Sumerian, Akkadian, and Aramaic words, which means that “der Verfasser des arsakidischen *Frahang* ein Verzeichnis in (sumerisch-)akkadisch-aramäischer Sprache in Buchstabenschrift benutzt hat. Dieses (sumerisch-)akkadisch-aramäische Wörterverzeichnis geht nach Stoffen und Anlage auf sumerisch-akkadische lexikalische Werke zurück” (Ebeling 1941: 4). For the relationship between *Frahang* and the Sumero-Akkadian terms, see Ebeling 1941: 69–72; Ebeling (1941: 88–89) ascribes the creation of (Sumero-)Akkadian-Aramaic lists to the activity of Aramaic scribes in Mesopotamia who wrote on parchment and papyrus already in the Neo-Assyrian period. Similarly to *VLev* 32a–36, the Pahlavi *Frahang* is closely related with *hubullu* lists (Ebeling 1941: 96–99).

(34) See Drawnel 2004: 330.

(35) The long coexistence of Aramaic and Akkadian in Babylonia in the first millennium B.C. makes it certain that Babylonian *ṭupšarrūtu* was sometimes vested in Aramaic garb by the Aramaic scribes, or by Late Babylonian scribes whose everyday language was Aramaic, with Akkadian used for scholarly purposes. A clay tablet from Seleucid Uruk was published by Thureau-Dangin (1922: no. 58) who recognized its content as written in cuneiform but in a different Semitic language, probably Aramaic. Subsequent elaborations of the text proved that the tablet contains two magical incantations written in Aramaic. Gordon (1938: 115) considered the language to be a good example of the Babylonian subdivision of Mesopotamian Aramaic. Since the text is written in good Aramaic, and cannot be considered as retranslated from Akkadian, it suggests that there existed an Aramaic tradition of magical literature; other texts, however, did not survive to our times, it is therefore difficult to ascertain the relationship between the Aramaic and Akkadian magical texts in southern Babylonia. The sheer existence of an Aramaic incantation text written in cuneiform witnesses to an interest of Akkadian exorcists in Aramaic incantations; additionally, the preserved Aramaic incantations do contain elements parallel to cuneiform magical tradition, see Dupont-Sommer 1940–41: 56–57.

tion of its religious polytheistic association. The myth of the fallen Watchers (*1 En.* 6–11) in the Enochic *Book of Watchers* has a complicated redactional history, and its creation may be due to many complex circumstances. However, the presentation of the fallen Watchers as teachers of different types of scribal craft (7:1; 8:3; cf. 8:1; 9:8) (36) read against the social background of Babylonia in the Persian, Hellenistic, and Arsacid periods suggests, that the expression “watchers and holy ones” refers to the group which busied itself with the development and transmission of magic and divination. The available evidence from Babylonia presents two priestly classes, *āšipu* or incantation priests (“exorcists”), and *kalû* or lamentation priests. While the latter priestly group is restricted to one important scribal family of Sîn-lēqi-unninni, the former is extensively attested in cuneiform sources and seems to play a dominant role in Babylonian scholarship in Uruk. Additionally, there are several indications in the text of the *Book of Watchers* that suggest the connection between the fallen Watchers and the *āšipu*. (37) One wonders whether the creation of the myth of the Watchers’ descent and transmission of their knowledge to humanity is directed against the Babylonian scribal tradition and its tradents.

First of all, one has to note that the list of crafts taught by the Watchers (7:1; 8:3) is composed of the elements that can be recognized as parts of Babylonian *āšipûtu* and *ṭupšarrûtu*: the practice of magic arts, diagnosis concerning mental disturbances, cutting and gathering of herbal roots, terrestrial and celestial divination. The terminology used in the Aramaic fragments (4Q201 frg. 1 iv and 4Q202 frg. 1 iii = 8:3) thematically falls into two parts: items 1–6 (see table below) contain Aramaic terminology that, when compared with professional activities of Babylonian scholars, can only be associated with the *āšipu*—physicians, exorcists, conjurers, and magicians. The second group (items 7–12) correctly describes the divinatory activities of the *ṭupšar Enûma Anu Enlil*, a title borne by the *āšipu* in Late

(36) The content of the Watchers’ teaching together with the material about Asael seems to be interpolated into the narrative flow of *1 En.* 6–11 (cf. Nickelsburg 2001: 165, 171–172), the purpose of the interpolation is, however, not clear for many commentators. The explanation of *1 En.* 8:3 shows an intrinsic relationship between the teaching of the Watchers and Babylonian magical and divinatory tradition. It seems that not only the content of the teaching but also the main bulk of the narrative in *1 En.* 6–11 is best explained against the Babylonian social and religious background, see the interpretation below.

(37) Siam Bhayro (2005: 22–24) interprets the “Watchers and Holy Ones” in *1 En.* 6–11 as an allusion to the Akkadian diviner *bārû*; one should note, however, that, although the extispicy series is known and studied, the professional activities of the *bārû* in Late Babylonian period are poorly attested, and almost non-existent in Hellenistic Uruk. It seems that with the rise of astrology in Neo-Assyrian period the practice of *bārûtu* began to decline. Additionally, the list of divinatory practices in *1 En.* 7:1 and 8:3 can hardly be linked with extispicy.

Babylonian period, and related to the astrological series found in the libraries belonging to the *āšipu*. The preserved terminology does not suggest any associations with the *bārû*, or *kalû* priests; the “cutting of roots” (no. 2) suggests the connection with the expertise of an *asû* (pharmacist), but the *āšipu* were also students of plant lists and experts in pharmacology.

Table 1. Babylonian Scholarship in Qumran Enochic Manuscripts
(1 En. 8:3) (38)

1	חבר[ו] (39)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 1 (8:3)	“spell-binding”
2	[מקטע שרשין] (40)	[4Q201 frg. 1 iv 1]	“cutting of roots”
3	חרש למ[שרא] (41)	4Q202 frg. 1 iii 2	“loosing of spells”
4	[כ]שפו (42)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 2	“sorcery”
5	חרטמו	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 2	“magic”
6	תוש[ין] (43)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 2	“skills”

(38) The following list is based on the Aramaic text established by Milik (1976: 157–158; 170–171). For the Greek text of the Gizeh version, see Charles 1912: 17, 19; for the text of 8:3 in the Syncellus’ *Chronography*, see Mosshammer 1984: 12.

(39) The first Aramaic term in the list is rendered in Greek (G) by ἐπαισιδᾶς; Sync. has a longer list that does not seem to exist in Aramaic: εἶναι ὀργὰς κατὰ τοῦ νοός.

(40) Milik (1976: 157) reconstructs the phrase on the basis of the Greek text: ῥίζοτομίας (G); cf. ῥίζας βοτανῶν τῆς γῆς (Sync.) in 8:3; ῥίζοτομίας and τὰς βοτάνας (G) in 7:1.

(41) See 8:3 ἐπαισιδῶν λυτήριον (G) and ἐπαισιδῶν λυτήρια (Sync.); 4Q201 frg. 1 iv 1 has a lacuna here, but 4Q202 frg. 1 iii 2 supplements the missing text: חרש למ[שרא]. The feminine form חרשה appears in 4Q201 frg. 1 iii 15 (7:1), while the emphatic חרשה[לשרא] is attested in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 (7:1). The Greek text, both G and Sync., renders it with φαρμακείας, a term which may refer in a general way to the use of drugs, potions, or spells, see LSJ, s.v. φαρμακεία. Taking into account the parallelism with 4Q202 frg. 1 iii 2, where the noun seems to be masculine singular, the general reference to the use of spells is likely.

(42) Nickelsburg (2001: 189) transcribes and restores the term differently: ṭspw (note the incorrect *samek*). Following Nickelsburg, Langlois (2008: 256) restores differently than Milik and proposes to read שפו[א] pointing to Dan 2:10, 27 where חרטמין accompany אשפין; thus in a similar way חרטמו would be preceded by שפו[א]. Although such a restoration would bolster the overall interpretation presented in this research that links the magical arts and divination in 8:3 with Babylonian *āšipūtu*, one should note that the abstract term אשפו is not attested in the Aramaic portions of Enoch, while the reading proposed by Milik is found in the parallel text, cf. [אשפין] in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 (7:1), corresponding to ἐπαισιδᾶς (G) and ἐπαισιδίας (Sync.). Instead of Milik’s [אשפין]פתא, Nickelsburg (2001: 197) again proposes a different reading אשפתא[א] which, however, is contradicted by the material reading of the manuscript, see pl. VI, frg. d in Milik 1976. From the palaeographic point of view, the text in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 requires additional study.

(43) Noting that precedent Aramaic terms in singular are rendered in Greek by plural forms, Langlois (2008: 258) reads the form in singular תוש[ין], similarly to Job 26:3, Prov 3:21, Isa 28:29. In his reconstruction Milik, in fact, seems to follow the Greek plural form σοφίας (Sync.), although he translates in singular “skill.” Since

7	[נחשי ברקין] (44)	[4Q201 frg. 1 iv 2]	“signs of lightning flashes”
8	נחשי כוכבין (45)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 3 = 4Q202 frg. 1 iii 3	“signs of the stars”
9	[נחשי זיקין] (46)	[4Q201 frg. 1 iv 3]	“signs of shooting stars”
10	נחשי [ר] ארע (47)	4Q202 frg. 1 iii 4	“signs of the earth”
11	נחשי שמ[ש] (48)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv 4	“signs of the sun”
12	[נחשי] שה[ר] (49)	4Q201 frg. 1 iv	“signs of the moon”

The Aramaic list does not transliterate Akkadian terminology related to magical and scribal craft, but seems to have recourse to general abstract terms that refer to some parts of Akkadian professional knowledge. The first three items in the list may refer to the *āšipūtu*: spell-binding, cutting of roots, loosing of spells. There exists little information about the process of root-gathering for medicinal purposes in ancient Mesopotamia, but available evidence suggests that it was linked with magical proceedings, which explains why the expression in the list in 8:3 is accompanied by two abstract terms concerning magic. On the other hand the association of the root-cutting with two terms related to the practice of magic suggests a therapeutic application of magical arts. The abstract term חבירו “spell-binding” is exemplified in *Deut* 18:11, which speaks, in negative terms, about charmers (“charmers of charm/enchantment” חבירי חרב; see *Ps* 58:6) (50) and parallels them with other types of forbidden magical practices. (51) *Isa* 47:9, 12 expressly connect the incanta-

the Aramaic term is only partially preserved, and the Greek translation renders it with a plural form, one should follow Milik’s proposal. Additionally, the magical and astrological context suggests that these areas of theoretical knowledge and its application require complex professional abilities.

(44) See (βα)ρακιήλ ἀστρολογίας (G); Milik (1976: 156) reconstructed the phrase “signs of thunders” on the basis of the name of the Watcher in 4Q201 frg. 1 iii 8 ברקאל, cf. βαρακιήλ in 6:7 (G). The Greek text (G) used a general term for celestial divination in plural ἀστρολογίας; cf. ἀστρολογία (Sync.) taught by the fourth Watcher.

(45) The Greek text (G) uses one term τὰ σημειωτικά, the noun τὰ σημειωτικά in *Gd’az* probably translates τὰ σημειωτικά. The Greek translator probably omitted כוכבין in his rendering of the Aramaic expression.

(46) Milik (1976: 157) reconstructs this phrase on the basis of the name of the Watcher in 4Q201 frg. 1 iv 3: ליקא, see ליקא in 4Q204 frg. 1 ii 26; cf. Ζακίηλ (Sync.) in 6:7, and זיקין in 4Q204 frg. 1 vi 20 (*I En.* 14:8).

(47) See τὰ σημεία τῆς γῆς (Sync.); 4Q201 frg. 1 iv 3 has a lacuna here, but 4Q202 frg. 1 iii 4 supplements the reading.

(48) See τὰ σημεία τοῦ ἡλίου (Sync.).

(49) See τὰ σημεία τῆς σελήνης (Sync.); cf. σεληναγωγίας (G).

(50) The LXX translates the expression in *Deut* 18:11 with ἐπαειδὼν ἐπαιδοῦν, “the one who chants an incantation/spell” while in *Ps* 58:6 (57:6) the Greek translator interprets the Hebrew text, but also in relation to practice of magic: φαρμάκου φαρμακευομένου παρὰ σοφοῦ.

(51) The *Visions of Amram* probably speaks about the enchanters (4Q547 frg. 3

tions (חברִיך) (52) with Babylon, and in both cases the term is paralleled with sorceries (כשפִיך) (53), the practise of which foretells an impending doom of their practitioners. The expression חרש למִשרא (4Q202 frg. 1 iii 2; ἐπασοιδῶν λυτήριον [G] and ἐπασοιδῶν λυτήρια [Sync.]) “loosing of spells” does not occur in the OT, although the noun חרש may appear in one context. (54) The term חרש “spell, enchantment, incantation,” appears in Ugaritic, (55) Syriac, (56) Mandaic, (57) Ethiopic, (58) and Jewish Babylonian Aramaic. (59) Milik reconstructs the verb in *peʿal* infinitive למִשרא “to loose, untie” on the basis of the Greek versions (λυτήριον and λυτήρια). (60) The same *peʿal* infinitive “to loosen, untie” appears in *Dan* 5:16 “untie knots” (וקטִרִין למִשרא), (61) which may suggest Daniel’s magical competence. (62) The same verb with a similar meaning is also present in Jewish Palestinian Aramaic (63) and in Jewish Babylonian Aramaic (64) with the same meaning, but the connection with חרש is not attested.

5, 6) in a fragmentary context; note that 4Q547 frg. 3 1 mentions the presence of a demon (שד). For the use of the root *h-b-r* in the OT, see Cazelles 1980.

(52) While in *Isa* 47:12 the LXX translates חברִיך with ταῖ ἐπασοιδᾶι σου “your charms/incantations,” the Greek text in *Isa* 47:9 reads τῶν ἐπασοιδῶν which may mean “your charms/incantations,” or “your charmers/enchanters,” from ἐπασοιδός, ὁ, cf., e.g., *Exod* 7:11. In view of *Isa* 47:12, the former interpretation seems to be preferable. Note that in *Isa* 47:13 *IQIsa*^a reads חוברִי שמים “those who enchant the heavens,” instead of חוברִי שמים found in the MT.

(53) In both cases the LXX renders the term with φαρμακεία, a term which may generally denote “sorcery, magic,” or “use of drugs,” cf. LSJ, s.v.

(54) Cf. *Isa* 3:3 where in the expression חכם חרשים the noun in plural חרשים probably refers to the magical spells, cf. the next expression נבון לחש “expert in charms” in the same verse. The LXX, however, translates it with σοφὸν ἀρχιτέκτονα “a skilful master-builder,” rendering חרשים with a singular form from the noun “craftsman” חרש.

(55) See del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2003: 1: 371, *hrš*.

(56) See Brockelmann 1928: 259, *hhršʿ*, meaning 2.

(57) See Drower and Macuch 1963: 127, *haršia* 3, “enchantments, spells.”

(58) See Leslau 1991: 243, *haras*, *hars*.

(59) See Sokoloff 2002: 485, חרשי, abs. pl. חרשין, cf. the plural form in Mandaic.

(60) See λυτήριος, ον, “loosing, delivering,” also in relation to demons and illnesses., cf. LSJ, s.v.

(61) In *Dan* 5:12 one finds a parallel expression, ומשרא קטרין, pointed by the Massoretes as a *paʿel* participle. Bauer and Leander (1927: §26 i), however, correct the vocalization and read a *peʿal* infinitive. For a passive participle שרין “untied,” see *Dan* 3:25; cf. also *Dan* 5:6 קטרי חרצה משתרין.

(62) For the use of the term קטר “knot” in the Aramaic incantation from Seleucid Uruk, see Incantation A, line 1, Incantation B, line 27, in Dupont-Sommer 1940–41: 38–39, and comments on p. 41. For the possible connection between *Dan* 5:16 and Mesopotamian magic, see also Paul 1992.

(63) See Sokoloff 1990: 567, שרי, meaning 8: “to release from a spell, ban.”

(64) See Sokoloff 2002: 1180, שרי, *itpeʿel*, meaning 2: “to be released from a spell.”

There is only one professional area of practice and literature in ancient Babylonia that deals with spell-binding and loosing of spells, namely the medical and theurgic (65) knowledge of *āšipūtu*, exercised by the *āšipu* who recites (*manû*), utters (*qabû*), whispers (*lahāšu*), casts (*nadû*) a *šiptu* ("incantation, spell") (66) in order to ward off witchcraft, sorcery, evil portents, to subdue evil demons, and to heal a patient. The Akkadian literature of *āšipūtu* related to the profession of the priest-exorcist is enormous, but the Enochic author here most probably makes a reference not to a literary corpus but to the practical execution of the profession by the *āšipu* as the connection with the cutting and gathering of roots (no. 2), loosing of spells (no. 3) and sapiential skills (no. 6) suggests. The process of loosing (Akk. *pašāru* (67) or *paṭāru* (68)) all sorts of evil is well attested in the collections of incantations against witchcraft and *māmītu* "oath" (*Maqlu* (69) and *Šurpu* (70)) in *Lipšur* litanies, (71) in the *namburbi* rituals administered in order to avert the danger portended by different kinds of omens, and in other types of incantation series and medical literature. The *namburbû* (Sum. NAM.BŪR.BI, "loosing rites") rituals make part of the *āšipu*'s standard curriculum of studies, (72) and the incantation priest was the main official of the whole procedure. (73)

The cutting of roots in 8:3 is attested in the Gizeh translation (ῥίζοτομία), while Syncellus uses a similar expression "roots of the herbs of the earth ῥίζας βοτανῶν τῆς γῆς (Sync.) in 8:3; the Gizeh fragment in 7:1 speaks about ῥίζοτομία and τὰς βοτάνας, thus suggesting two areas of expertise in contrast to the Syncellus expression. It seems, however, that both Greek versions in 8:3 refer to the same work related to gathering of herbs for magic and healing purposes. In

(65) For an insightful distinction between magic and theurgy in the context of Babylonian practice of exorcism, see Bottéro 1990: §59 and 60.

(66) Cf. CAD Š/3, *šiptu* A. The Akkadian term *šiptu* "incantation" and *āšipu* "incantation priest" come from the same root (*w-š-p*) and are related to the verb (*w*)*ašāpum*, attested in D (*uššupu*), "to cure by exorcism," cf. AHW III, p. 1484. For the typology of the incantations and bibliography, see Röllig 1990: § 3.8.1 and 4.8.1.

(67) Cf. CAD P, *pašāru*, meaning 1: "to loosen"; meaning 2: to exorcise, release (a person), to undo (evil, sorcery, curse, sin, divine anger); meaning 10, 2' *puššuru*, "to undo, loosen, evils, curses, sin."

(68) See CAD P, *paṭāru*, meaning 3: "to undo, release, to remove, dispel evil, sin, sorcery, oath, disease, worries, anger"; meaning 10, 2': *puṭṭuru* "to remove sins, afflictions, oath, (ill-portending) signs."

(69) See the collection of articles on the series by Abusch 2002: 99–292.

(70) For the analysis of the incantations and rituals in the series, see Bottéro 1985: 163–219.

(71) See Reiner 1958; see the frequently occurring phrases: "*lipšur* "may he undo, absolve"; *lu paṭranni lu pašranni* "let it be released for me, let it be absolved for me!" Reiner has pointed out many overlappings between *lipšur* litanies and *Šurpu* series.

(72) See KAR 44 r. 6: *namburbi ittāt šamê u er šetim*; see Bottéro 1985: 82.

(73) For a detailed presentation of the ritual, see Maul 1994: 37–113.

Greek the term ῥίζοτομία means “cutting *and* gathering of roots,” similarly to the expression ῥίζοτομέω βοτάνας “to cut and gather herbal roots” for medical and magical purposes. (74) The ῥίζοτόμος “root-cutter” (= “herbalist”), known in ancient Greece and in the Middle Ages, gathered herbs for purposes of medicine or magical practices, which was often accompanied by magical rites and precautions necessary to ensure the medical/magical efficacy of the herbs and to protect the gatherer from possible malefic influences at the gathering. (75) In a similar way some prescriptions in Babylonian medical texts specify the rules and precautions to follow at the gathering of a plant: “(Look for) a gourd which grows alone in the plain; when Šamaš has gone down, cover your head with a kerchief, cover the gourd too, draw a magic circle with flour around it, and in the morning, before Šamaš comes out, pull it up from its location, take its root (*šurussu leqēma*)...” (76) Note that the root extraction ritual takes place during the night, when the Babylonian ῥίζοτόμος isolates the plant with a magic circle, covers it, and covers his head as well; he pulls the root up in the morning but before sunrise. It is not certain whether this instruction was intended for an *āšipu* or *asû*, because the expertise of the latter covered texts listing plants related to the illness they could be used to treat. While the professional activities of the two medical practitioners overlapped to a certain degree, (77) drawing a magic circle and flour manipulation connected with the root extraction recalls the healing practices of the *āšipu*. (78)

The connection with the healing practices of the *āšipu* is additionally suggested by an expression preserved by Syncellus (*I En.* 8:3): “Shemihazah taught that there are natural impulses against the mind (εἶναι ὁργὰς κατὰ τοῦ νοός), and roots of the plants of the

(74) Cf. ῥίζοτομέω in LSJ, *s.v.*

(75) For the description of different magical proceedings and rites the “herbarius” was supposed to follow, see Delatte 1938.

(76) For the text and translation, see Reiner 1995: 36.

(77) See Ritter 1965: 314–317.

(78) See Scurlock 2006: no. 222: 8–13, 36, 38, for a medical prescription concerning the ritual burial of a clay figurine: “You plant three cedar shavings around (the figurine). (You) surround it with a magic circle. You put an unbaked fermenting vessel over it as a cover. Let Šamaš see the fermenting vessel by day; let the stars see it by night. For three days (by) day, the *āšipu* ... (and) sets up a censer (burning) juniper before Šamaš; by night, (he) scatters emmer flour before the stars of the night. Before Šamaš and the stars, for three days, he repeatedly recites over it ... (You) put it (the figurine) in a jar and then you administer an oath to it ... You bury it (the pot) in an abandoned waste.” For the use of different types of flour in healing rituals, see Scurlock 2006: 44; for magic encirclements, see Scurlock 2006: 57–59 and Ritter 1965: 311; for ritual burials, see Scurlock 2006: 50–53. Cf. also the invocation directed to Assaluhi, the patron god of exorcism: “May Asalluhi, patron god of exorcism (*a-ši-pu-[t]i*), release you (*[li]pašširkāma*) by means of the plants of the mountains (*šammē ša šadê*) and the plants of the deep (*šammē ša naqbi*)”; see CAD A/2, p. 435, *āšipūtu* b.

earth" (καὶ ῥίζας βοτανῶν τῆς γῆς). Although the Greek phrase εἶναι ὀργὰς κατὰ τοῦ νοός seems to be absent in Aramaic, (79) it is not corrupt (80) and describes an emotional state (81) that militates against human mind. Behind the Greek ὀργή one should read the Aramaic term רגו that denotes deep emotional disturbance (cf. *Dan* 3:13, "fury and rage" [ברגו וחמה] of Nebuchadnezzar). (82) The root *r-g-z* is also common in the Old Testament, where with animate subjects it expresses primarily the somatic phenomenon ("to tremble," *Exod* 15:14; *Deut* 2:25; *Ezek* 12:18, etc.), secondarily a psychic emotion ("to be" or "become disturbed," *2 Sam* 19:1; *Job* 3:17; 14:1; 39:24; *Prov* 29:9, etc.; cf. רגו לב in *Deut* 28:65). The lexical field of "anger" seems to be absent in the use of the root in the OT. (83) The Greek text here therefore implies that Shemihazah's teaching refers to emotional disturbances that affect the mind. An Aramaic incantation written with the use of cuneiform signs from Seleucid Uruk shows that the work of the enchanter who stressed his sapiential skills (אנה חכים) (84) was also directed against human רגו: "Who rages (רגו)? Who is maddened (מתרגו)? Who wears the garb of ragings (שמלת רגו), fire in his mouth, (herbal) mixtures u[nder his] tongue? So-and-so (m), son of so-and-so (f.), (85) rages and is maddened (רגו ומתרגו) and wears the garb of ragings (שמלת רגו), fire in [his] mou[th] and (herbal) mixtures under his tongue. I am wise (אנה חכים), I will scrut[e] (?) the one who begets (?) [evil (?)]. I take a knot from [...] the one who brings to silence from between the wall (?). I enter upon so-and-so that n[ot...]. I strip him of the garb of his ragings (שמלת רגויה). I clothe him with the garb of

(79) Note that the Syncellus' text is longer than the Gizeh fragment, but the overlapping with the Aramaic manuscripts indicates that the longer list is much closer to the known form of the Aramaic text than the Greek version preserved in the Gizeh fragment.

(80) Against Flemming and Radermacher 1901: 26, who correct εἶναι ὀργὰς to ἐπασιδῶς; cf. Charles 1906: 19, n. 12; Nickelsburg 2001: 189, n. to v. 3a; Moss-hammer (1984: 12) in his critical edition of the Greek text did not change Syncellus' reading.

(81) See LSJ, p. 1246: "ὀργή, ῥή, natural impulse or propensity (v. ὀργάω II: 1. to be in heat, desire sexual intercourse, or 2. generally, to be eager or ready, to be excited): hence, temperament, disposition, mood." The derivative meaning denotes "anger, wrath."

(82) Although not exclusively, the LXX translates the root *r-g-z* with ὀργή and ὀργίζω, see *Hab* 3:2 (ἐν ὀργῇ); 3:17 (θυμὸν ὀργῆς); 3:26 (ὀργῇ); *Gen* 45:24 (μὴ ὀργίζεσθε); *Exod* 15:14 (ὀργίσθησαν); *Job* 12:6 (παροργίζουσιν); *Ps* 4:5 (ὀργίζεσθε); 99 (98): 1 (ὀργίζεσθωσαν); *Prov* 29:9 (ὀργιζόμενος).

(83) For the analysis of the OT use of *r-g-z*, see Vanoni 2004.

(84) Note that in *Dan* 5:15 the term "wise men" (חכמיא) stand in apposition to āšipu (אשפיא), see also the list of magicians and diviners in *Dan* 2:27: חכמינ אשפינ.

(85) The Aramaic form does not identify the patient by name, similarly to Akkadian tradition, see the generic form with the reference to the personal god or goddess, *annanna apil annanna ša ilšu* ^d*annanna ištāršu* ^d*annannītu*, cf. Bottéro 1990: 219.

his rest (שמלת דמיה). I take the fire from [his] mouth and (herbal) mixtures from under [his tongue].” (86) Although the identity of the enchanter is not known in this Aramaic text, the cuneiform literature shows that the *āšipu* was trained to diagnose different kind of illnesses, mental disturbances included, and to treat them with incantations, magical rites, and herbal medicaments; the terminology used in Akkadian diagnostic literature is, of course, different. (87)

The next abstract term, “sorcery” (כּשַׁפּוּ), is partially reconstructed, but the same root reappears in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 (7:1), probably in the feminine emphatic state. The term is of Akkadian origin where it refers to the practices of black magic and witchcraft. (88) In the biblical texts it denotes magical or divinatory practices in most cases performed by non-Jewish practitioners, and expressly forbidden by the law in Israel. (89) The following abstract term “magic” (חרטמו) is of Egyptian origin, (90) and the noun חרטמים (“soothsayer-priests”) designates magicians at the Egyptian (*Gen* 41:8, 24; *Exod* 7:11, 22; 8:3, 14, 15; 9:11) or Babylonian (*Dan* 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:4, 6; 5:11) court, where it is often listed together with אשפין/ם (*Dan* 1:20; 2:2, 10, 27; 4:4; 5:11), (91) with little difference in meaning. In the Aramaic text here the two terms (כּשַׁפּוּ and חרטמו) seem to denote magical practices in general, differently from the first three terms in the list that denote three particular magical actions (spell-binding, root-cutting and gathering, loosing of spells). The connotation of the root *k-š-p* in Akkadian with black magic opposed and fought against by the *āšipu* makes it probable that the Aramaic author used the term כּשַׁפּוּ here in order to denigrate the therapeutic

(86) Lines 19–33; for the transcription of the Akkadian text, Aramaic transliteration, translation and comments, see Dupont-Sommer 1940–41.

(87) See Scurlock 2006: 17–18, and references to the texts there.

(88) See CAD K, *kašāpu*, “to bewitch, to cast an evil spell”; *kaššāpu*, “sorcerer”; *kaššāptu*, “witch, sorceress”; *kaššāpūtu*, “witchcraft”; *kišpū*, “witchcraft, sorcery”; *kušāpu*, “bewitched substance.” It appears that the Aramaic term is a loanword of *kišpū*, “witchcraft, sorcery”.

(89) מכשפה, sorceress condemned to death (*Exod* 22:17); מכשפים, sorcerers at the pharaoh’s court (*Exod* 7:11); מכשף, law against sorcerer (*Deut* 18:10); כשפים, sorcerers of Israel’s neighbors (*Jer* 27:9); מכשפים, judgment against sorcerers (*Mal* 3:5); מכשפים, sorcerers at the Babylonian court (*Dan* 2:2); כשפים, sorceries of Israel (*Mic* 5:11); כשפיה, sorceries of Jezebel (2 *Kgs* 9:22); כשפין, sorceries of Babylon (*Isa* 47:9, 12); כשפים, sorceries of Niniveh (*Nah* 3:4, 4); כשף (*pi’el*), Manasseh practices sorcery (2 *Chr* 33:6).

(90) From Demotic *hr-tb(i)* < *hr-tp*, “reciting priest, magician”; in Akkadian in the Neo-Assyrian period *har-ti-bi* is associated with other Akkadian priests, *āšipu* included; cf. Müller 1986: 177.

(91) Because of this parallelism one is tempted to restore in 4Q201 frg. 1 iv 2 שפ[א], instead of Milik’s שפ[כ]; such a restoration would certainly fit the context much better, given the undeniable relation to the profession of the Babylonian *āšipu*. One should however note that the Aramaic text uses the root *k-š-p* in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 (7:1), thus the author/redactor of 1 *En.* 6–11 certainly intended to use this term in relation to the magical competence of the *āšipu*.

character of the medical practitioner in Babylonia. In the OT the root *k-š-p* refers to illicit practice of sorcery, and is sometimes paralleled with sexual intercourse that symbolizes idolatry. (92) The interpretation of the term כשפו therefore here and in 4Q202 frg. 1 ii 19 in the light of this OT association would place the magical knowledge of the Watchers (93) on the same level with πορνεία committed by the Watchers with women. (94) Thus it is probable that both the fornication with women and the transmission of knowledge to women denote idolatry of the Babylonian religion (95) within the structure of which the transmission of astronomical/astrological, medical, and magical knowledge occurred. Some names of the giants, children of fornication, known from the cuneiform literature seem to confirm such an interpretation. (96)

The last term in the first part of the list denotes practical skills necessary for the proper administration of spells and magical knowledge; Syncellus translates it with a plural term σοφίας that suggests sapiential connotations. In the Old Testament it also belongs to wisdom vocabulary, and is usually defined as “success, good result,” or “sound wisdom, prudence”; its precise meaning is, however, difficult to pinpoint. Thus the first part of the Aramaic list is closed with a term with strong sapiential connotations, which is appropriate given the scribal context of Babylonian scholarship linked with magic. The first three items seem to refer in general terms to actual magical practices of an *āšipu*, including one additional expression from the Syncellus’ text; the next three terms refer to magical knowledge and its sapiential context, but the connection with Babylonian *āšipūtu* is not so evident.

The second part of the list unequivocally refers to celestial divination, a scholarly field covered by the *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil* in the Neo-Assyrian period. The *āšipu* bore the same scholarly title in the Hellenistic period, and their interest in astrology and mathematical astronomy, together with the composition of their libraries, indicates that their studies covered also this field of Babylonian *ṭupšarrūtu*. (97) The noun נהש unequivocally shows that the Aramaic

(92) See 2 Kgs 9:22 (זוני איזבל / αἱ πορνεῖαι Ἰεζαβελ); Nah 3:4 (זוני וונה / πορνείας πόρνη; בִּזְנוּיָה / ἐν τῇ πορνείᾳ αὐτῆς).

(93) Note that in Isa 47:10 the LXX translates דעת “your knowledge” in reference to Babylon with ἡ πορνεία σου.

(94) See in 1 En. 6–11 πορνεία in 10:9 (G and Sync.), about “sons of fornication” meaning giants; πορνεύω, in 8:2 (G), in relation to the knowledge revealed by the Watchers; cf. 4Q203 frg. 8 9 בִּזְנוּתְכֶן “by your fornication,” most probably in relation to the Watchers’ sin.

(95) According to CT XLIX 140 6’-11’, the daughter of Zedaja and her daughters made part of the assembly of the *āšipu* in the Esağila temple, cf. McEwan 1981: 155.

(96) See in the *Book of Giants* Gilgamesh (4Q530 frg. 2 ii + 6–12 2; 4Q531 frg. 22 12) and Humbaba (Hobabesh) (4Q203 frg. 3 3; 4Q530 frg. 2 ii + 6–12 2).

(97) Note that the “manual of the exorcist” (KAR 44, r. 16) contains the *incipit* of the EAE series, which means that the series made part of the curriculum of studies

text deals with divination, (98) while the terminology used in the list recalls the general division of the *Enūma Anu Enlil* authoritative series the first part of which contained omina concerning the moon (tablets 1–14; 15–22), (99) the second part presented the omina that dealt with the sun (tablets 23 [24]–29 [30]; 30 [31]–35 [36]), (100) the third section was dedicated to the meteorological omens (tablets 36 [37]–49 [50]), (101) while the last one contained omina of stars and planets (tablets 50–70). (102) The Aramaic text seems to be aware of this division, when it lists the signs of the moon (no. 12), signs of the sun (no. 11), and signs of the lightning flashes (no. 7). (103) The signs of the stars (no. 8) seem to refer in a general way to celestial divination, (104) and cannot be unequivocally associated with planets; note, however, that the last part of the EAE series does not exclusively contain planetary omina (tablets 56, 59–63, 64–65), but also those that deal in their protases with stars and constellations (tablets 50–53, 57, 68). (105)

The expression “signs of the shooting stars” (no. 9) has been reconstructed, but the term ܬܦܪ appears in 4Q204 frg. 1 vi 20 (*I En.* 14:8) where the Greek text (G) renders it with διαδρομαὶ τῶν ἀστέρων (lit. “[irregular] courses of the shooting stars”), (106) and

in the *āšipu*’s formation, and in the Neo-Assyrian was included among other series of exorcism (KAR 44, r. 4: *rēšē iškari āšipūti*); Bottéro 1985: 81, 85. The presence of the EAE in the library of an *āšipu* in Seleucid Uruk suggests that in Late Babylonian period the curriculum of studies and of professional interest was not changed.

(98) In the OT uses the verb ܬܦܪ (*pi’el*) denotes divinatory practices, see *Gen* 44:5, 15; *Deut* 18:10; *Lev* 19:26; *I Kgs* 20:33; *2 Kgs* 17:17; 21:6; *2 Chr* 33:6.

(99) For the discussion of the tablet order in this section, see Weidner 1941/44 and Weidner 1954/56.

(100) For the discussion of the tablet order in this section, see Weidner 1968/69.

(101) For the discussion of the tablet order in this section, see Gehlken 2005.

(102) For the discussion of the tablet order and their content in this section, see Hunger and Pingree 1999: 19–20.

(103) Tablets 42–46 of the EAE series deal with thunders while tablet 47 with lightings and earthquakes, see Table 1 in Gehlken 2005: 258–259. Most of the weather section awaits publication, at present only the incipit of the tablets preserved in the cuneiform catalogues are known.

(104) Although the Aramaic text does not overlap with the Greek in this case, nevertheless the terms ἀστρολογία (G) and ἀστρολογίαν (Sync.) seem to render the Aramaic expression quite literally.

(105) Note that the planetary omens did not exclusively refer to the planets, but reported their positions in relation to various constellations, stars, and paths of Enlil, Anu, and Ea, see Reiner and Pingree 1998: 6–20.

(106) See LSJ διαδρομή, ἡ, s.v. Milik (1976: 156) is convinced that, by using this expression, the Greek translator did not render ܬܦܪ correctly. Note, however, that the Greek noun διαδρομή from the verb διαδραμεῖν, “running to and fro through” a city, assumes the irregular movement of a shooting star on the sky, which correctly corresponds to the actual phenomenon, and correctly modifies the meaning of ἀστήρ. Cf. the following description of a flash in the sky from the letter of Bel-Ušeizib: “If a flash appears and appears again in the south, makes a circle and again makes a circle, stands there and again stands there, flickers and flickers again, and is scattered: the ruler will capture property and possessions in his expedition” (Parpola 1993: 89). For *mišhu*, “flash,” or “train” of meteor, see CAD M/2 *mišhu* meaning d.

the expression stands in parallelism with διαστραπαί (“lightnings”), similarly to 14:11 and 14:17. One of the Watchers who teaches [יִקְיָאֵל] bears the name “Zakiel” (4Q201 frg. 1 iv 3: לִיִּקְיָאֵל [8:3], see לִיִּקְיָאֵל in 4Q204 frg. 1 ii 26, Ζακιήλ [Sync.] in 6:7), and is presented as the eighth Watcher in 6:7 (Sync.), who in 8:3 (Sync.) teaches ἀεροσκοπίαν. The latter term is most probably corrupt for ἀστεροσκοπίαν (G), (107) taught in the Gizeh text by Σαθ(ι)ελ, probably corrupt for “Zakiel.” (108) The term ἀστεροσκοπίαν comes from the noun ἀστήρ, ὁ, gen. ἀστέρος “star, or shooting star,” (109) and verb σκοπέω, “behold, contemplate,” and in the context of 14:8, 11, 17 should mean “watching of the shooting stars.” Hence the first part of the Greek compound term corresponds to יִקְיָאֵל “shooting stars,” and thus its meaning does not unequivocally overlap with ἀστροσκοπίαν “star watching” (110) (8:3 [Sync.]).

It is difficult to find in the text of the *EAE* a whole section dedicated to the shooting stars, although one finds rare references there to *kakkabu rabû* (Sum. MUL GAL), (111) “a great star” that falls (*maqātu*), (112) flares up (*šarāhu*), (113) or flashes (*šarāru*). (114) A flashing star is sometimes compared to a torch (*dipāru*): (115) “If a star flashes like a torch (*ki GiŠ.di-pa-ri*) from the east and sets in the east: the main army of the enemy may fall.” (116) In another case from the *EAE* section dedicated to weather phenomena the fragmentary text suggests that the same term is identified with a celestial phenomenon: “If a torch is seen in the sky [].” (117) Additionally, the same term metaphorically refers to Babylonian gods, and is found in

(107) Charles (1906: 18, n. 9) considers ἀστεροσκοπίαν (G) to be corrupt for ἀεροσκοπίαν in 8:3 (Sync.); note that it is easier to explain the omission of -στ- from ἀστεροσκοπίαν than the addition of the same two letters to ἀεροσκοπίαν.

(108) See Charles 1906: 18, n. 8; Milik 1976: 159, n. b.

(109) See LSJ ἀστήρ, ὁ, gen. ἀστέρος, I.1. “star, shooting star, or meteor”; 2. “flame, light, fire”; ἀστήρ πέτρινος “meteoric stone.” The term ἀστεροσκοπίαν is a compound noun where the first part is a noun with a consonant stem: ἀστέρ-ο-σκοπίαν; cf. Smyth 1984: §873.

(110) See the Greek noun ἄστρον, τό, mostly in plural, “the stars” in LSJ, s.v. The term ἀστροσκοπίαν is a compound noun where the first part is a noun with a consonant stem ἀστρ-ο-σκοπίαν.

(111) Tablet 16, omen 5, see Weidner 1954/56: 74, n. 12. A falling star may also be simply called *kakkabu*, cf. CAD K, *kakkabu* 2. Shooting stars can be found not only in the *EAE* series, but also in the *Šumma ālu* series, cf. Rochberg-Halton 1988: 61–62. For the occurrences in the section of the *EAE* dedicated to the planets, see CAD Š, *šarāru* meaning B.

(112) See CAD M/1, *maqātu* meaning 1f.

(113) See CAD Š, *šarāhu* meaning C 1a referring to the shooting stars or planets.

(114) See CAD Š, *šarāru* meaning B 1, said mainly of shooting stars.

(115) See CAD D

(116) Parpola 1993: 89, no. 111, l. 3–4; see Hunger 1992: 170, no. 303, r. 2–5.

(117) [*šumma di*]-*pa-ru ina šamê innamirma* [], see CAD D *dipāru* a.

personal names: *Bēl-dipārī* “Bēl-is-my-torch.” (118) One is tempted to see a parallel development in Aramaic in relation to the term זיקין and personal name of the Watcher זיקיאל, where זיק would come from Akkadian *zīqu* or *zīqtu*, “torch,” (119) a term parallel in meaning with *dipāru*. The term זיק “torch” would denote in a figurative sense a shooting star, similarly to the Akkadian term *dipāru*. If the proposed interpretation is correct, such a development must have occurred in Aramaic astronomical/astrological literature, because *zīqu* or *zīqtu* in Akkadian are not attested in relation with the stars. (120) On the basis of the Greek translation of זיקין in *1 Enoch* one should render the Aramaic term with “shooting stars.”

The “signs of the earth” (no. 10, נחש[ן] ארע, are listed among expressions relating to celestial divination (no. 9, “signs of the shooting stars,” no. 11, “signs of the sun”). The principal series of terrestrial divination (*Šumma ālu ina mēlē šakin*, “If a city is set on a height”) (121) composed of around one hundred twenty tablets contained omnia related to the following topics: house, main place of human inhabitation (tablets 1–53); fields and gardens located in the city area (tablets 54–60); rivers and water courses in the city area (tablets 61–63); birds (tablets 64–79); behavior of human beings and animals (tablets 80–87); weather in the city (tablet 88); light given by lamps and torches (tablets 91–94); prayer (tablets 95–96); sexual behavior of men (tablets 103–104); family relations (tablet 105); religious processions (tablet 120). The content of tablets 90, 97–102, 106–119 is either not clearly understood or not known. The listing of the “signs of the earth” with celestial divination in 8:3 does not seem to be haphazard. The “Diviner’s Manual” lists the *incipits* of tablets with terrestrial divination, then *incipits* of tablets containing celestial divination. Then the author comments on the relationship of these two types of divination: “Sky and earth both produce portents; though appearing separately, they are not separate (because) sky and earth are related. A sign that portends evil in the sky is (also) evil on

(118) See CAD D *dipāru* b.

(119) CAD Z, *zīqu* B, s. fem., “torch”, and *zīqtu*, s.fem., with the same meaning; Kaufman (1974: 115–116) affirms that the relationship of the Akkadian terms with the Aramaic *zīqā* “shooting star” are unclear, although he does not exclude it altogether. For the overview of the use of זיקין in various contexts, see Langlois 2008: 260–261, who translates זיקיאל with “bourrasque de El,” or “météore de El.”

(120) In *Tg. Neofiti* Exod 20:2 and 3, not based on the biblical text, the word of God is compared to shooting stars (זיקין), lightning’s (ברקין), and torches of fire (למפדין דנור). The use of the Greek loan word למפד “a torch” (cf. λαμπάς, λαμπάδος, ἡ, “a torch”) shows that the text sees a parallelism between the movement of the shooting stars, lightning’s, and the irregular light of a torch. The description of the movement of the word of God before its being engraved on the tables of the covenant reminds one of the irregular movement of a meteor: “It flew and circled in the air of the heavens and came back...”; cf. also *Tg. Ps.-J.* Exod 20:2, 3.

(121) For the general overview of the series see Moren 1978; for partial publication of the series, see Freedman 1998 and Freedman 2006.

earth, one that portends evil on earth is evil in the sky.” (122) In order, therefore, to correctly interpret the signs of the earth, one has to read them in conjunction with the signs of the sky. This principle seems to account in the cuneiform texts for listing celestial divination catalogues together with the catalogues referring to the terrestrial divination series. (123) The interrelation between celestial and terrestrial divination in ancient Babylonia is additionally stressed by the hemerological series *Iqqur īpuš* (“he tore down, he built”) in which the thematic order of omens in the first part (§§ 1–66) essentially follows the order found in the *Šumma ālu* series, while the thematic order in the second part (§§ 67–104) reflects the order of the *Enūma Anu Enlil* series. (124) Note that Iqīša’s library from Uruk included the tablets of the *Šumma ālu* series together with the fragments of the EAE texts. (125)

Both the Gizeh translation and Syncellus’ text preserve the same term in a slightly different form: ἀστροσκοπίαν (Sync.), “star watching,” where the second element –σκοπίαν comes from the verb σκοπέω “behold, contemplate,” found also in connection with the observation of the stars and of the solar eclipse. (126) The Greek term does not seem to have a corresponding equivalent in the Aramaic text in the form it is known today, and it can hardly refer to the classical *Enūma Anu Enlil* written tradition, because it clearly refers to star watching, without any association with the term “signs” (נִחְשִׁין/σημεῖα). On the other hand, it is found in the list together with celestial divination, similarly to Isa 47:13 which speaks about those who gaze at the stars (הַחֲזִיזִים בַּכּוֹכָבִים/οἱ ὀρῶντες τοῦς ἀστέρους) in the astrological context.

The satire against the Babylonian *āšipu* represented under the guise of the fallen Watchers becomes even more pungent when one reads the rest of the story in *1 En.* 8–11. The *āšipu* were supposed to free the ill person from the illness with the application of their medical and magical knowledge, linked with purification rites and the expulsion of the demonic forces. The opposite happens in the case of the Watchers’ didactic activity, which, together with the intercourse with women, leads to their uncleanness, to the oppression of human-

(122) lines 39–42, text and translation by Oppenheim (1974: 200, 204).

(123) See Freedman 1998: 322–323; Fincke 2001: 19–20.

(124) For the text edition and French translation of the series *iqqur īpuš*, see Labat 1965.

(125) The “manual of the exorcist” (KAR 44, r. 16) cites among the literature to study and consult by the *āšipu* also the *Šumma ālu* series; see Bottéro 1985: 85. Additionally, tablets 1 and 2 of the *sakikkū* diagnostic series contained signs concerning terrestrial divination, while tablet 2 specifically cites omens that are excerpts from the *Šumma ālu* series, see Heeβel 2001–2002.

(126) See LSJ, s.v. σκοπεύω = σκοπέω “behold, contemplate (rather of particulars than universals, of which θεωρέω is more commonly used, but οἱ τὸν ἥλιον ἐκλείποντα θεωροῦντες καὶ σκοποῦμενοι, Plato, *Phaedrus*, 99d).”

ity, violence, death, and destruction. This is why the whole earth has to be healed from its wounds caused by the didactic activity of the Watchers (10:7), the Watchers are imprisoned (10:4–5, 11–14), and their descendants, giants, called bastards or half-breeds (10:9) are to be destroyed (10:9–10). Thus the role of the physician/magician who uses scribal knowledge and magic to heal the patient and expel demons or ghosts of the dead is denigrated with the indication of the results opposed to those expected from an *āšipu*. The denigration of the role of the *āšipu* in relation to their function as exorcists continues in the development of the story in *1 En.* 12–16. The giants are called evil spirits, and from the bodies of the fallen giants there arise evil spirits (15:8–16:1) that oppress humanity until the day of the great judgement. Additionally, the incantations and spells administered by the *āšipu* were intended to free the patient from all sorts of evil, while, according to *1 En.* 9:8 the Watchers teach the women charms for producing hatred (μίσητρα [Sync.]). (127)

The above analysis of some parts of Jewish Aramaic literature indicates that on the one hand the Jewish scribes accepted the Aramaic version of the cuneiform scholarship related with time measurements, although deeply rooted in the Akkadian astrological tradition. The case of the *Visions of Levi* shows the same tendency to accept the Aramaic form of the Sumero-Akkadian lexical tradition in the education of the priestly apprentices. Levi is depicted as an ideal priest and scribe who wholeheartedly embraces the Aramaic learning (ספר), and presents it as the main object of study and teaching for his sons/pupils. On the other hand, the association of Babylonian magic and scribal learning with the Watchers points to a strong condemnation of Babylonian scholarship that is eventually destined to be destroyed by the flood together with the main bearers of this tradition—priestly exorcists disguised as Watchers.

If the myth of the Watchers was composed in Babylonia, as the above analysis suggests, one is tempted to transfer the opposition between Aramaic ספר and Akkadian *ṭupšarrūtu* to the world of social opposition between the Babylonian priestly scribes (*ṭupšarru*) versed in cuneiform literature and the *sepīru*, bilingual scribes writing in Aramaic on parchment and papyrus. As the extensive genealogies of the *kalû* and *āšipu* show, the priestly families of cuneiform scribes in the Persian and Seleucid periods belonged to important strata of Babylonian society. There are not genealogies of *sepīru* preserved, and their social status appears to be much lower than that of the cuneiform scribes. (128) In Seleucid Uruk and earlier they are mostly

(127) The text of the Enochic myth provides additional indications that strengthen the connection between the *āšipu* and Watchers. Since the present research is coming to its close, a full explanation must await another occasion.

(128) Cf. McEwan, 1981: 30: “The *sepīru* never bears a clan affiliation and thus may be considered to have held an inferior social status to that of the *ṭupšarru*.”

found as witnesses in legal contracts and economic transactions, and rarely as one of the party; (129) however, in the Neo-Assyrian period the term is associated with other officials in the provincial government and central administration. (130) Since they wrote on parchment, their literary activity is today lost.

It is not certain whether the Jewish composers of the Watchers' myth were priests, although thematic and literary contacts between Enochic literature and the *Visions of Levi* suggests a strong relationship with Levitical priesthood. Additionally, little is known about the *sepīru*, so that even the genealogy of the term is disputed. However, the presentation of both Levi and Enoch as students of ספר indicates a strong relationship with Aramaic scholarship influenced by Akkadian cuneiform literature. It is not clear whether the Aramaic texts that show the influence of Akkadian scribal tradition were written by Jewish scholars, or whether they were only adopted and adapted to the cultural and religious structure of Judaism. In the former case one has to assume that the Jewish boys went through the long process of cuneiform education, which is not attested in historical sources from Babylonia. (131) The latter option seems to be more attractive in view of the available evidence: Aramaic versions of the lexical lists (*VLev* 32a–36), lunar visibility periods (*4Q208* and *4Q209*), general characterization of Babylonian magic and divination (*4Q201* frg. 1 iv; *4Q202* frg. 1 iii). Thus while the Watchers and their Babylonian scholarship inevitably lead to the destruction of the flood, the astronomical/astrological lore in Aramaic is eventually classified as revealed by God through the intermediary of His angel Uriel. The Late Babylonian cultural and religious milieu was the place where both the *AAB* and the myth of the Watchers (*I En.* 6–11) arose, and against which they have to be interpreted. Once these Aramaic texts were brought to Judaea, the contact with Babylonian culture and religion was probably lost, and the texts began to live an independent life within the structure of the Second Temple Judaism. One cannot ex-

This accords well with what is known of the *sepīru* in earlier periods, when he is also thought to have had an inferior social status." The office of *sepīru* is attested in cuneiform literature from the Neo-Assyrian Period through the Seleucid period, usually in witness lists.

(129) Note Enoch's presentation as witness in relation to his scribal activities in *Jub.* 4:18–19, 23–24.

(130) See Pearce 1999:357–360; note also the tale about Ahiqar and the Persian court setting in the fragmentary story recounted in *4Q550*.

(131) The tales of Daniel and his companions at the court of Babylonian rulers (*Dan* 1–6) present the Jewish boys incorporated into the structure of Babylonian education and learned magi only to show the superiority of their intelligence due to their piety and faithfulness to the God of Israel. The Akkadianisms in Aramaic of Daniel point to the language used in Babylonia at the time and are not a proof of the competence in Akkadian of those who composed the tales, while the text can hardly be interpreted as containing a historical account, cf. Müller 1976.

clude the possibility, though, that contacts with Babylonian learning centres continued until the end of cuneiform culture, contributing to the development of Enochic traditions, perhaps even until the destruction of the temple by the Romans. Our knowledge in this respect is, however, more than limited.

Henryk DRAWNEL

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abusch, Tzvi. 2002. *Mesopotamian Witchcraft: Toward A History and Understanding of Babylonian Witchcraft Beliefs and Literature*. Ancient Magic and Divination 5. Leiden: Brill.
- Bauer, Hans, and Pontus Leander. 1927. *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen*. Halle: M. Niemeyer.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain. 2000. "The Descendants of Sîn-lēqi-unninni." Pages 1–16 in *Assyriologica et Semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*. Edited by Joachim Marzahn et al. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 252. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- 2004. "New Into Old: Religious Reforms Under Nabonidus and in Late Babylonian Uruk." *Mitteilungen für Anthropologie und Religionsgeschichte* 16:305–319.
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain, and John P. Britton. 1994. "Rituals for an Eclipse Possibility in the 8th Year of Cyrus." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 46:73–86.
- Bhayro, Siam. 2005. *The Shemihazah and Asael Narrative of 1 Enoch 6–11: Introduction, Text, Translation and Commentary with Reference to Ancient Near Eastern and Biblical Antecedents*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 322. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Böck, Barbara. 2000a. "'An Esoteric Babylonian Commentary' Revisited." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120:615–620.
- 2000b. *Die babylonisch-assyrische Morphoskopie*. Archiv für Orientalforschung, Beiheft 27. Wien: Institut für Orientalistik der Universität Wien.
- 2003. "'When You Perform the Ritual of 'Rubbing'': On Medicine and Magic in Ancient Mesopotamia." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 62:1–16.
- Bottéro, Jean. 1985. *Mythes et rites de Babylone*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, IVe Section, Sciences Historiques et Philologiques 328. Paris: H. Champion.
- 1990. "Magie. A. In Mesopotamien." Pages 201–234 in volume 7 of *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*. Dietz O. Edzard et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Britton, John P. 1993. "Scientific Astronomy in Pre-Seleucid Babylon." Pages 61–76 in *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens: Beiträge zum 3. Grazer Morgenländischen Symposium (23.–27. September 1991)*. Edited by Hannes D. Galter. Grazer Morgenländische Studien 3. Graz.

- Brockelmann, Carl. 1928. *Lexicon syriacum*. 2nd ed. Halle: M. Niemeyer.
- Cagni, Luigi. 1986. "Le fonti mesopotamiche dei periodi neo-babilonese achemenide e seleucide (vi–iii sec. a.C.)." *Rivista biblica* 34:11–51.
- Cazelles, Henri. 1980. "חָבָר chābar; חֶבֶר chābhēr." Pages 193–197 in volume 4 of *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. Translated by David E. Green. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977–2006.
- Charles, Robert Henry. 1906. *The Ethiopic Version of the Book of Enoch*. Anecdota oxoniensia, Semitic Series 11. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- 1912. *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Dandamayev, Muhammad A. 1994. "Achaemenid Mesopotamia: Traditions and Innovations." Pages 229–234 in *Achaemenid History VIII. Continuity and Change: Proceedings of the Last Achaemenid History Workshop, April 6–8, 1990 – Ann Arbor, Michigan*. Edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg et al. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten.
- del Olmo Lete, Gregorio, and Joaquín Sanmartín. 2003. *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*. Translated by Wilfred G. E. Watson. 2 vols. Handbook of Oriental Studies: The Near and Middle East 67. Leiden: Brill.
- Delatte, Armand. 1938. *Herbarius: Recherches sur le cérémonial usité chez les anciens pour la cueillette des simples et des plantes magiques*. Bibliothèque de la Faculté de philosophie et lettres de l'Université de Liège 81. Paris: E. Drozd.
- Drawnel, Henryk. 2004. *An Aramaic Wisdom Text from Qumran: A New Interpretation of the Levi Document*. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 86. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Driel, van. 1987. "Continuity or Decay in the Late Achaemenid Period: Evidence from Southern Mesopotamia." Pages 159–181 in *Achaemenid History I: Sources, Structures and Syntheses. Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*. Edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten.
- Drower, Ethel S., and Rudolf Macuch. 1963. *A Mandaic Dictionary*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Dupont-Sommer, André. 1940–41. "La tablette cunéiforme araméenne de Warka." *Revue d'assyriologie et d'archéologie orientale* 37:35–62.
- Ebeling, Erich. 1941. *Das aramäisch-mittel-persische Glossar Frahang-I-Pahlavik im Lichte der Assyriologischen Forschung*. Mitteilungen der Altorientalischen Gesellschaft 14/1. Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Farber, Walter. 1987. "Neues aus Uruk: Zur "Bibliothek des Iqīša". " *Die Welt des Orients* 18:26–42.
- Fincke, Jeanette C. 2001. "Der Assur-Katalog der Serie *enūma anu enlil* (EAE)." *Orientalia* 70:19–39.
- Flemming, Johannes, and Ludwig Radermacher. 1901. *Das Buch Henoch*. Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte 5. Leipzig: Hinrich.
- Freedman, Sally M. 1998. *If a City Is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu in mēlê šakin*. Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 17. Philadelphia: Samuel Noah Kramer Fund.

- 2006. *If a City Is Set on a Height: The Akkadian Omen Series Šumma ālu in mēlê šakin*. Occasional Publications of the Samuel Noah Kramer Fund 19. Philadelphia: Samuel Noah Kramer Fund.
- Gehlken, Erlend. 2005. "Die Adad-Tafeln der Omenseries *Enūma Anu Enlil*. Teil 1: Einführung." *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 36:235–273.
- Geller, Markham J. 2000. "Incipits and Rubrics." Pages 225–258 in *Wisdom, Gods and Literature: Studies in Assyriology in Honour of W. G. Lambert*. Edited by Andrew R. George *et al.* Winona Lake, Ind.: Eisenbrauns.
- Gesche, Petra D. 2001. *Schulunterricht in Babylonien im ersten Jahrtausend v. Chr.* Alter Orient und Altes Testament 275. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Gordon, Cyrus H. 1938. "The Aramaic Incantation in Cuneiform." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 12:105–117.
- Greenfield, Jonas C. 1985. "Aramaic in the Achaemenian Empire." Pages 698–713 in *The Cambridge History of Iran: Vol. 2: The Median and Achaemenian Periods*. Edited by Ilya Gershevitch. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Heeßel, Nils P. 2000. *Babylonisch-assyrische Diagnostik*. Alter Orient und Altes Testament 43. Münster: Ugarit Verlag.
- 2001-2002. "'Wenn ein Mann zum Haus des Kranken geht...' Intertextuelle Bezüge zwischen der Serie *šumma ālu* und der 2. Tafel der Serie SA.GIG." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 48/49:24–49.
- Hunger, Hermann. 1976. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil 1*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 9. Berlin: Mann.
- 1991. "Schematische Berechnungen der Sonnenwenden." *Baghdader Mitteilungen* 22:513–519.
- 1992. *Astrological Reports to Assyrian Kings*. State Archives of Assyria 8. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Hunger, Hermann, and David Pingree. 1999. *Astral Sciences in Mesopotamia*. Handbuch der Orientalistik. Erste Abteilung. Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 44. Leiden: Brill.
- Kaufman, Stephen A. 1974. *The Akkadian Influences on Aramaic*. Assyriological Studies 19. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Kuhrt, Amélie. 1987. "Written Sources for Babylonia under the Later Achaemenids." Pages 147–157 in *Achaemenid History I.: Sources, Structures and Syntheses. Proceedings of the Groningen 1983 Achaemenid History Workshop*. Edited by Heleen Sancisi-Weerdenburg. Leiden: Nederlands Instituut voor Het Nabije Oosten.
- Labat, René. 1951. *Traité akkadien de diagnostics et pronostics médicaux*. 2 vols. Collection de Travaux de l'Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences 7. Paris: Académie Internationale d'Histoire des Sciences.
- 1965. *Un calendrier babylonien des travaux des signes et des mois (Séries iqur ipuš)*. Bibliothèque de l'École des Hautes Études, IVE Section (Sciences Historiques et Philologiques) 321. Paris: H. Champion.
- Langlois, Michaël. 2008. *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d'Hénoch: Étude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân*. Lectio divina, hors série. Paris: Cerf.

- Leslau, W. 1991. *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English / English-Ge'ez with an index of the Semitic roots*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Maul, Stefan M. 1994. *Zukunftsbewältigung: Eine Untersuchung altorientalischen Denkens anhand der babylonisch-assyrischen Löserituale, Namburbi*. Baghdader Forschungen 18. Mainz am Rhein: Verlag Philipp von Zabern.
- McEwan, Gilbert J. P. 1981. *Priest and Temple in Hellenistic Babylonia*. Freiburger Altorientalische Studien. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner.
- Milik, Joseph Thaddée. 1976. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford: Clarendon.
- Moren, Sally M. 1978. *The Omen Series "Šumma ālu": A Preliminary Investigation*. PhD, University of Pennsylvania.
- Mosshammer, Alden A. 1984. *Georgii Syncelli Ecloga chronographica*. Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana. Leipzig: Teubner.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. 1986. "חַרְטֹם *hartōm*." Pages 176-179 in volume 5 of *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. Translated by John T. Willis et al. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977-2006.
- Müller, Hans-Peter. 1976. "Märchen, Legende und Enderwartung: Zum Verständnis des Buches Daniel." *Vetus Testamentum* 26:338-350.
- Naveh, Joseph, and Jonas C. Greenfield. 1984. "Hebrew and Aramaic in the Persian Period." Pages 115-129 in *The Cambridge History of Judaism: I. Introduction; The Persian Period*. Edited by William D. Davies. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Neugebauer, Otto. 1983. *Astronomical Cuneiform Texts: Babylonian Ephemerides of the Seleucid Period for the Motion of the Sun, The Moon, and the Planets*. 3 vols. Sources in the History of Mathematics and Physical Sciences 5. New York: Springer.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E. 2001. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1-36; 81-108*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis, Minn.: Fortress Press.
- Oelsner, Joachim. 1993. "Aus dem Leben babylonischer Priester in der 2. Hälfte des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr. (am Beispiel der Funde aus Uruk)." Pages 235-242 in *Šulmu IV: Everyday Life in Ancient Near East: Papers Presented at the International Conference, Poznań, 19-22 september, 1989*. Edited by Julia Zabłocka et al. Poznań: Adam Mickiewicz University Press.
- 2000. "Von Iqīšā und einigen anderen spätgeborenen Babyloniern." Pages 797-814 in *Studi sul Vicino Oriente antico dedicati alla memoria di Luigi Cagni: Volume 2*. Edited by Simonetta Graziani. Istituto Universitario Orientale, Dipartimento di Studi Asiatici, Series Minor. Napoli: Istituto Universitario Orientale.
- 2002. "Babylonische Kultur nach dem Ende des babylonischen Staates." Pages 49-73 in *Religion und Religionskontakte im Zeitalter der Achämeniden*. Edited by Reinhard G. Kratz. Veröffentlichungen der Wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie 22. Gütersloh: Ch. Kaiser.
- Oppenheim, A. Leo. 1969. "Divination and Celestial Observation in the Last Assyrian Empire." *Centaurus* 14:97-135.

- 1974. "A Babylonian Diviner's Manual." *Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 33:197–220.
- 1975. "The Position of the Intellectual in Mesopotamian Society." Pages 37–46 in *Wisdom, Revelation, and Doubt: Perspectives on the First Millennium B.C.* Edited by Benjamin I. Schwartz. Proceedings of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences 104/2. Boston: American Academy of Arts and Sciences.
- Parpola, Simo. 1993. *Letters from Assyrian and Babylonian Scholars*. *States Archives of Assyria* 10. Helsinki: Helsinki University Press.
- Paul, Shalom. 1992. "Decoding a 'Joint' Expression in Daniel 5:6, 16." *Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University* 22:121–127.
- Pearce, Laurie E. 1999. "Sepīru and ^{Lú}A.BA: Scribes of the Late First Millenium." Pages 355–368 in *Languages and Cultures in Contact: At the Crossroads of Civilisations in the Syro-Mesopotamian Realm*. Edited by Karel Van Lerberghe *et al.* *Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 96. Leuven: Peeters.
- Pearce, Laurie E., and L. Timothy Doty. 2000. "The Activities of Anu-belšunu, Seleucid Scribe." Pages 331–341 in *Assyriologica et semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*. Edited by Joachim Marzahn *et al.* *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 252. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Reiner, Erica. 1958. *Šurpu: A Collection of Sumerian and Akkadian Incantations*. *Archiv für Orientforschung. Beiheft* 11. Gratz.
- 1995. *Astral Magic in Babylonia*. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society* 85/4. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- Reiner, Erica, and David Pingree. 1998. *Babylonian Planetary Omens: Part Three*. *Cuneiform Monographs* 11. Groningen: Styx.
- Ritter, Edith K. 1965. "Magical-Expert (= *āšipu*) and Physician (= *asû*): Notes on Two Complementary Professions in Babylonian Medicine." Pages 299–321 in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger on His Seventy-Fifth Birthday, April 21, 1965*. *Assyriological Studies* 16. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Robson, Eleanor. 2008. *Mathematics in Ancient Iraq: A Social History*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Rochberg, Francesca. 1993. "The Cultural Locus of Astronomy in Late Babylonia." Pages 31–45 in *Die Rolle der Astronomie in den Kulturen Mesopotamiens: Beiträge zum 3. Grazer Morgenländischen Symposium (23.–27. September 1991)*. Edited by Hannes D. Galter. *Grazer Morgenländische Studien* 3. Graz.
- 1998. *Babylonian Horoscopes*. *Transactions of the American Philosophical Society Held at Philadelphia for Promoting Useful Knowledge* 88, Pt. 1. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.
- 2000. "Scribes and Scholars: The *ṭupšar Enūma Anu Enlil*." Pages 359–375 in *Assyriologica et semitica: Festschrift für Joachim Oelsner anlässlich seines 65. Geburtstages am 18. Februar 1997*. Edited by Joachim Marzahn *et al.* *Alter Orient und Altes Testament* 252. Münster: Ugarit-Verlag.
- Rochberg-Halton, Francesca. 1988. *Aspects of Babylonian Celestial Divination: The Lunar Eclipse Tablets of Enūma Anu Enlil*. *Archiv für Orientforschung. Beiheft* 22. Horn: F. Berger.

- Röllig, Wolfgang. 1990. "Literatur." Pages 35–66 in volume 7 of *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*. Dietz O. Edzard et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Sachs, Abraham. 1948. "A Classification of the Babylonian Astronomical Tablets of the Seleucid Period." *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 2:271–290.
- Sallaberger, W., and W. Huber Vulliet. 2003–2005. "Priester. A. I. Mesopotamien." Pages 617–640 in volume 10 of *Reallexikon der Assyriologie und Vorderasiatischen Archäologie*. Dietz O. Edzard et al. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Scurlock, JoAnn. 1999. "Physician, Exorcist, Conjurer, Magician: A Tale of Two Healing Professionals." Pages 69–79 in *Mesopotamian Magic: Textual, Historical, and Interpretative Perspectives*. Edited by Tzvi Abusch et al. Ancient Magic and Divination 1. Groningen: Styx.
- 2006. *Magico-Medical Means of Treating Ghost-Induced Illnesses in Ancient Mesopotamia*. Ancient Magic and Divination 3. Leiden/Boston: Brill/Styx.
- Smyth, Herber Weir. 1984. *Greek Grammar*. Revised by Gordon M. Messing. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Sokoloff, Michael. 1990. *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period*. 2nd ed. Dictionaries of Talmud, Midrash and Targum 2. Ramat Gan: Bar Ilan University Press.
- 2002. *A Dictionary of Jewish Babylonian Aramaic of the Talmudic and Geonic Periods*. Dictionaries of Talmud Midrash and Targum 3. Ramat Gan/Baltimore: Bar Ilan University Press/Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Swerdlow, N. M. 1999. "Introduction." Pages 1–19 in *Ancient Astronomy and Celestial Divination*. Edited by Noel M. Swerdlow. Dibner Institute Studies in the History of Science and Technology. Cambridge, Ma.: MIT Press.
- Thureau-Dangin, François. 1922. *Tablettes d'Uruk à l'usage des prêtres du temple d'Anu au temps des Séleucides*. Musée du Louvre. Département des antiquités orientales. Textes cunéiformes 6. Paris: P. Geuthner.
- Vanoni, G. 2004. "רָגַז; rāḡaz; רֹגֶז; rōḡez, etc." Pages 304–308 in volume 13 of *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. G. Johannes Botterweck et al. Translated by David E. Green. Grand Rapids, Mich.: Eerdmans, 1977–2006.
- von Weiher, Egbert. 1983. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil 2*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 10. Berlin: Mann.
- 1988. *Spätbabylonische Texte aus Uruk, Teil 3*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 11. Berlin: Mann.
- 1993. *Uruk: Spätbabylonische Texte aus dem Planquadrat U 18, Teil 4*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 12. Berlin: Mann.
- 1998. *Uruk: Spätbabylonische Texte aus dem Planquadrat U 18, Teil 5*. Ausgrabungen der Deutschen Forschungsgemeinschaft in Uruk-Warka 13. Berlin: Mann.
- Weidner, Ernst F. 1941/44. "Die astrologische Serie Enūma Anu Enlil." *Archiv für Orientforschung* 14:172–195, 308–318.

- 1954/56. “Die astrologische Serie Enûma Anu Enlil.” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 17:71–89.
 - 1968/69. “Die astrologische Serie Enûma Anu Enlil.” *Archiv für Orientforschung* 22:65–75.
- Zimmern, Heinrich. 1916. “Zu den “Keilschrifttexten aus Assur religiösen Inhalts.” *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* 30:184–229.

עֲרַב UND אֹת

Ein Beitrag zum hebräischen Lexikon und zum Verhältnis von *CD* zu *IQS*

Die Bedeutung der hebräischen Verbalwurzel אֹת, die neben biblischen und rabbinischen Belegen auch in *CD* XX 7 und 4Q266 frag. 11,15 begegnet, ist umstritten. Da in *IQS* VII 24 und VIII 34 in vergleichbaren Aussagen sich stattdessen das Hitpa'el von עֲרַב findet, gehen einige Forscher davon aus, dass beide Ausdrücke an diesen Stellen letztlich synonym seien. Schließlich wurde kürzlich darauf verwiesen, dass in einigen Targumtexten אֹת mit עֲרַב wiedergegeben wird, worin man den exegetischen Hintergrund der angenommenen Synonymie sehen könnte. Eine genaue Durchsicht der biblischen und rabbinischen Belege ergibt jedoch, dass אֹת Handlungen bezeichnet, die erwünscht oder nutz- bzw. interessenorientiert sind. Diese Bedeutung liegt offenkundig auch in den *CD*-Belegen vor. Eine Analyse der Aussagen von *CD* und *IQS* zeigt, dass der Wechsel in der Terminologie sich einem Wechsel der Aussageintention und nicht einem synonymen Gebrauch beider Wörter verdankt. Und eine Analyse der Targumtexte ergibt, dass die Wiedergabe mit עֲרַב dort das Ergebnis einer späteren Entwicklung der palästinischen Targumtradition ist und zudem עֲרַב eine völlig andere Konnotation aufweist.

The meaning of Hebrew אֹת – known not only from the Bible and rabbinic texts but also found in *CD* XX 7 and 4Q266 frag. 11,15 – is debated. Since in comparable contexts, *IQS* VII 24 and VIII 34 has עֲרַב hitpa'el instead of אֹת, some assume both to be synonymous. Finally, it was pointed out that some Targums translate אֹת using עֲרַב which could be taken as the exegetical background of the alleged synonymy. But an analysis of the biblical and rabbinical texts reveals that אֹת denotes a desirable acting or an acting lead by benefit or interest – a meaning also to be found in *CD*. On the other hand, the terminological change between *CD* and *IQS* is obviously based on a change of intention and not on a synonymy of both words. Finally, an analysis of the targumic texts reveals, that the use of עֲרַב there is the result of a later development and that עֲרַב is used in a completely different meaning.

IN CD XX 7 und 4Q266 frag. 11,15 begegnet jeweils im Kontext von Bestimmungen zum Ausschluss eines Mitgliedes aus der Gemeinschaft die Bestimmung, dass niemand **אות** mit (**עם**) diesem machen soll. CD XX 7 spezifiziert dies mit **בהון ובעבודה** „im Hinblick auf Besitz und Dienst“.

Die genaue Bedeutung der Wurzel **אות** an diesen beiden Stellen ist umstritten, (1) was die Unsicherheit hinsichtlich ihrer Grundbedeutung in der bisherigen lexikalischen Forschung widerspiegelt. Da sie im Alten Testament und im rabbinischen Schrifttum in unterschiedlichen Kontexten begegnet, gehen die jeweiligen Wörterbücher auch von unterschiedlichen Bedeutungen aus. So setzt man für die alttestamentlichen Stellen (*Gen* 34:15,22,23; *2 Kön* 12:9) „willfahren, einverstanden sein“ an, (2) worauf sich die Übersetzung der Belege in den Qumrantexten mit „to agree with“ (3) berufen können. Dabei ist umstritten, ob man die biblischen Formen als Qal (*Ges*¹⁸) oder als Nif'al (HAL) interpretieren soll.

Im Gegensatz dazu bieten die traditionellen Wörterbücher für die rabbinischen Texte für **אות** Nif'al die Bedeutung „etwas nutzen, etwas genießen, gern haben“, (4) was sich in den Übersetzungen der Qumranbelege mit „to derive benefit from him“ (5), „have any enjoyment of him“ (6) oder „shall profit him“ (7) niederschlägt. Da beides (8) an den jeweiligen Stellen nicht so recht zu passen scheint,

(1) Eine Übersicht über die gängigen Übersetzungen findet sich bei J. Joosten, *Megillot 1* (2003): 226-219 (222-223).

(2) Vgl. W. Gesenius, *Hebräisches und Aramäisches Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament* (18. Aufl., bearb. u. hg. v. R. Meyer u. H. Donner [= *Ges*¹⁸], Lf. 1, Berlin u.a., 1987), 28b: „willfahren, einverstanden sein“; W. Baumgartner, *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament* (3. Aufl. [= HAL], Lf. 1, Leiden, 1967), 25b: „einwilligen, willfahren“; D.J. Clines (Hg.), *The Dictionary of Classical Hebrew* (= DCH) (1, Sheffield, 1993), 165b; diese Deutung wurde dann im neuzeitlichen Hebräischen wieder aufgegriffen, vgl. E. Ben Yehuda, *Thesaurus totius hebraicitatis et veteris et recentioris* (= Thesaurus) (I, New York – London, 1960), 122a.

(3) So z.B. Ch. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (Oxford, 1958), 38; L. H. Schiffman, *The Halakhah at Qumran* (StJLA 16: Leiden, 1975), 58 (mit direktem Verweis auf *2 Kön* 12:9); M. Knibb, *The Qumran Community* (CCWJCW 2: Cambridge, 1987), 70; F. García Martínez – E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden u.a., 2000), 597 (zu 4Q266 frag. 11,15); DCH.

(4) Vgl. z.B. J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim* (I, Berlin – Wien, 1924), 48b: „gern haben; insbesondere genießen, vergnügt sein, Nutzen haben“; M. Jastrow, *A Dictionary of the Targumim, the Talmud Babli and Yerushalmi, and the Midrashic Literature* (I, London, 1886), 36a „to be suited, pleased, whence to be gratified, to enjoy“; Thesaurus I, 123a-b; vgl. schon A. Kohut (Hg.), *Aruch Completum* (I, Wien, 1878), 330, s.v. **אָט**.

(5) So J.M. Baumgarten in *Qumran Cave 4. XIII: The Damascus Document* (4Q266-273), (DJD 18: Oxford, 1996), 77, zu 4Q266 frag. 11,15.

(6) So der Alternativvorschlag von Rabin (vgl. Anm. 3).

(7) S. Schechter, *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* (Cambridge, 1910), 75.

(8) Worauf sich die Übersetzung bei B.Z. Wacholder, *The New Damascus*

hat schon Schechter (9) vermutet, dass אור hier de facto mit der besonderen Bedeutung „sich verbinden, gemein machen“, „gemeinschaftliche Sache machen“ vorliege, was in vielen Übersetzungen aufgegriffen wurde (10) – zumal in ähnlichen Kontexten in *IQS* VII 24 und VIII 23 vergleichbare Formulierungen mit ערב Hitpa'el begegnen. (11) Letzteres wurde jüngst von Jan Joosten (12) aufgegriffen, der diese Sonderbedeutung als Aufnahme einer Auslegung von אור in *Gen* 34 erklären will, die auch in einigen Targumtraditionen begegne.

Bevor man sich aber näher mit dieser These auseinandersetzt, sollte man zunächst an Hand der Belegstellen und ihrer Kontexte prüfen, inwieweit die divergierenden Angaben der Wörterbücher zum Alten Testament und zum rabbinischen Schrifttum zutreffen oder ob hier nicht doch eine gemeinsame semantische Grundlage zu finden ist, von der her dann auch die Belege aus der *CD*-Tradition erklärt werden können. Zu diesem Zweck werde ich zuerst die nicht-qumranischen Belege jeweils kurz in ihrem Kontext analysieren und die Beobachtungen zu einer Beschreibung des semantischen Feldes von אור zusammenfassen, um von dort her zu einer Deutung der Belege in *CD* und *4Q266* zu kommen. Auf Grund dieser Ergebnisse kann dann eine Einschätzung darüber gegeben werden, ob der qumranische Gebrauch sich problemlos in die hebräische Sprachgeschichte einfügt oder eine Sonderentwicklung auf Grund exegetischer Traditionen zu *Gen* 34 darstellt, wie es von Joosten vorgeschlagen wurde.

Der alttestamentliche Befund

Die vier Belege der Wurzel אור begegnen im Alten Testament lediglich in zwei Kontexten: zum einen in der Erzählung über Dina, *Gen* 34 (V. 15, 22, 23), zum anderen im Kontext der Neuregelung der Abgaben zur Tempelerhaltung durch Joas, *2 Kön* 12:6-17 (V. 9). In beiden Fällen beschreibt die Wurzel die Reaktion auf den Wunsch eines anderen hinsichtlich dessen, was man (nicht) tun soll.

In *Gen* 34 schlägt einerseits Hamor der Sippe Dinas vor, sich bei ihm niederzulassen und mit seiner Gruppe zu verschwägern (V. 8-9).

Document (STDJ 56; Leiden, 2007), 107, im Sinne von „to welcome“ stützt, bleibt mir verborgen.

(9) Vgl. Anm. 7.

(10) So z.B. E. Lohse, *Die Texte aus Qumran* (Darmstadt, ³1981), 105; J.M. Baumgarten – D. Schwartz in *PThSDSSP* 2, 1995, 35; García Martínez – Tigchelaar (vgl. Anm. 3), 579 zu *CD* XX 7; bezeichnend auch C.M. Murphy, *Wealth in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Qumran Community* (STDJ 40; Leiden, 2002), die als Bedeutung von אור in Qumran zwar „to agree with“ angibt (91.493, vgl. o. Anm. 3), dies aber im Sinne von „forming partnerships with“ verstehen will (222).

(11) Schon Rabin (vgl. Anm. 3) hat auf die Nähe von *CD* XX 7 zu *IQS* VIII 23 aufmerksam gemacht; vgl. auch Lohse (Anm. 10) 291; Murphy (Anm. 10) 222.

(12) Vgl. Anm. 1.

Andererseits stellen diese die Annahme des Angebots unter den Vorbehalt, dass sich die Leute Hamors beschneiden lassen (V. 15-17). In beiden Fällen wird die Annahme des Vorschlages bzw. die Bereitschaft, entsprechend zu handeln, mit אֹרֶת ausgedrückt, wobei mit ל sowohl der Adressat (V. 15, 22, 23) als auch die Explikation der Handlung angeführt werden kann, in die man einwilligt oder sich bereit erklärt zu tun (V. 22).

In 2 Kön 12:9 bezeichnet אֹרֶת ganz analog das Einverständnis bzw. die Bereitschaft der Priester, dem Vorschlag Joas' zu folgen, dass sie in Zukunft nicht mehr das Geld zur Bauerhaltung des Tempels einsammeln sollten (V. 8). Zugleich entbindet dies sie aber auch von der Verpflichtung, sich um die Baumaßnahmen zu kümmern (V. 9). Die Betonung dieser positiven Folge des königlichen Wunsches für die Priester in V. 9 zeigt deutlich, dass אֹרֶת hier nicht einfach den Gehorsam gegenüber dem Befehl einer absoluten Macht konnotiert. Vielmehr bezeichnet die Wurzel die Bereitschaft oder das Einverständnis der Priester, die im Sozialgefüge des königzeitlichen Judas durchaus eine eigenständige politische Macht darstellten, auf den Wunsch des jungen Königs einzugehen. Dabei wird wie in Gen 34:22 die Handlung, auf die sich אֹרֶת bezieht, mit ל eingeführt.

Dieser eindeutige Befund erlaubt jedoch noch nicht, den Bedeutungshorizont von אֹרֶת enger abzugrenzen. Zwei wesentliche Fragen lässt die spärliche Beleglage im Alten Testament offen:

- a) Der Verbalstamm der Belege ist unklar, da es sich bei den vorliegenden Formen (13) jeweils um Qal oder Nif'al handeln kann – selbst wenn man die masoretische Vokalisierung beachtet.
- b) Offen bleibt letztlich auch, ob אֹרֶת an den genannten Stellen primär die *Einwilligung* der Subjekte bezeichnet, also im Sinne von „willens sein, etwas zu tun“ oder „jemandem zu Willen sein“ zu verstehen ist, oder aber der Ton auf dem *Handlungsaspekt* liegt: „entsprechend einem Interesse oder wunschgemäß *handeln*“. (14)

Mittelhebräisch

Die Belege für אֹרֶת aus dem rabbinischen Schrifttum (15) sind hinsichtlich der sich bei den biblisch-hebräischen Belegen stellenden

(13) יֵאָדָה (Gen 34:22), וַיֵּאָדָה (2 Kön 12:9), נֹאדָה (Gen 34:15), נֹאדָה (Gen 34:23).

(14) Dabei könnte man als Indiz für letzteres anführen, dass die alternative Zurückweisung des Vorschlages in Gen 34 in V. 14 mit עֲשֵׂה formuliert wird, was den Blick auf die Handlungs- und nicht auf die Absichtsebene lenkt. Jedoch gehört dieser Vers wohl nicht ursprünglich zu der Grunderzählung, zu der V. 15 und 22-23 gehören; vgl. Verf., „We Have a Little Sister“, in: Henten, Jan Willem – Brenner, Athalya, *Families and Family Relations* (STAR 2: Leiden, 2000), 49-80 [63-64].

(15) Die Belege sind recht einfach über die Internet-Datenbank Ma'agarim der Academy of the Hebrew Language in Jerusalem (<http://hebrew-treasures.huji.ac.il/>) zu finden, die die Texte auf der Grundlage der besten Manuskripte bietet. Die Textzitate in diesem Aufsatz beruhen auf den dort gebotenen Textversionen.

Fragen eindeutiger:

- a) In diesen Schriften wird אִית durchweg im Nif'al benutzt.
- b) Die reflexive Konnotation des Nif'al kommt darin zum Ausdruck, dass אִית Nif'al das Handeln in einem positiven Bezug auf den Handelnden im Sinne von „im Hinblick auf/für sich selbst handeln“ bezeichnet. Die Handlung selbst wird durch die Wurzel nicht spezifiziert. Wenn sie oder der Kontext, in dem sich das Handeln ereignet, konkretisiert werden sollen, so werden die entsprechenden Angaben zumeist mit ב eingeleitet. Entsprechend kann die Phrase mit ב häufig mit „(etwas) für sich selbst nutzen“ übersetzt werden. Diese transitive Wiedergabe sollte jedoch nicht darüber hinwegtäuschen, dass die Phrase korrekter – aber weniger elegant – mit „an etwas im Hinblick auf sich selbst – und insbesondere im Hinblick auf das eigene Wohl oder die eigenen Interessen – handeln“ zu übersetzen wäre.

Besonders deutlich wird der reflexive Aspekt des im Hinblick auf sich selber Handelns in der wohl ursprünglichen Fassung von *mAb* 4,5 העולם נטל חייו מן העולם (16): „Jeder, der die Tora für sich selbst nutzt (der für sich persönlichen Nutzen aus den Worten der Tora zieht), der entfernt sein Leben aus der Welt.“ Es liegt auf der Hand, dass die Aussage des persönlichen Nutzens der Handlung hier allein אִית Nif'al eignet und nicht vom Kontext her eingetragen wird – und ohne diese Konnotation von אִית Nif'al wäre der Satz unverständlich. Zugleich ist auch deutlich, dass אִית Nif'al eben nicht einfach „etwas nutzen, etwas genießen, gern haben“ bedeutet, wie es die gängigen Wörterbücher suggerieren, (17) sondern in besonderem Maße der reflexive Aspekt des Eigennutzes – also eben das reflexive Element des Nif'als – zum Ausdruck kommt.

Entsprechend begegnet אִית Nif'al zusammen mit ב in dem Verbot, das Lehrhaus für private Tätigkeiten oder Vorteile – und sei es nur zum Schutz vor Hitze oder Wärme, zum Essen oder Trinken oder ähnlichem – zu nutzen (*tMeg* 2,18). (18) *bMeg* 28b erklärt dazu, dass aber die Weisen und ihre Schüler die Lehrhäuser für sich nutzen dürfen, da es ja eigentlich ihre eigenen Häuser seien. (19)

(16) Vgl. die Kaufmann-Handschrift; diese Textform anstatt des häufig in den Ausgaben zu findenden הנהנה ist auch in einer Mekhila-Tradition zu *Dtn* 33:2 belegt, vgl. M. Kahana, *Tarbiz* 57 (1987/88): 165-201 (194, Z. 7-8).

(17) Vgl. Anm. 4; mithin ist auch der etymologische Hinweis, der sich noch in *Ges*¹⁸ findet irreführend, wo als Bedeutung für mittelhebräisch אִית Nif'al schlicht „gern haben, genießen“ angegeben wird (28b).

(18) בתי כנסיות אין נוהגין בהן קלות ראש. לא יכנס בהן בחמה מפני החמה ובצנה מפני הצנה ובגשמים מפני הגשמים. ואין אוכלין בהן ואין שותין בהן ואין ישנים בהן ואין מטיילין בהן ואין גיאותין בהן.

(19) ואין גיאותין בהן. אמ' רבא. חכמי ותלמידיהם מותרין. כר' יהושע בן לוי. דאמ' ר' יהושע בן לוי. מאי בי רבנן. ביתא דרבנן.

Diese Konnotation lässt sich auch an den meisten anderen Stellen aufweisen, an denen das Wort im rabbinischen Schrifttum begegnet. Dabei ergibt sich aber auch, dass **אֹרֶת** Nif'al den Aspekt des persönlichen Nutzens lediglich als semantisch reflexive Aussage im Sinne von „für sich (selbst) nutzen“ und nicht als ethische Kategorie des „Eigennutzes“ konnotiert.

So wird **אֹרֶת** Nif'al + **ב** auch für die Aussage benutzt, dass die Priester gewisse Abgaben für sich bzw. nach ihren eigenen Vorstellungen nutzen dürfen, seien es Salz und Holz beim Opfer (*mŠeq* 7,7; *tŠeq* 3,4 (20), *bMen* 21b; vgl. *LevR* 2,9) oder die Häute von Tieren, deren Unreinheit erst nachträglich festgestellt wird (*mEd* 2,2; *mZeb* 12,4 (21); *bZeb* 104a). Nach *mBer* 8,6 (22) darf man über eine Lampe erst dann den Segen sprechen, wenn ihr Licht so hell geworden ist, dass man es für sich nutzen könnte. (23) *bJoma* 11a (24) diskutiert die Frage, inwieweit Räume, die Frauen für sich selbst nutzen, mit einer Mesusa zu versehen sind, wobei die Diskussion dort zeigt, dass es sich hier um eine private Nutzung der Räume zum Bad oder Ankleiden handelt.

Entsprechend kann auch **אֹרֶת** Nif'al in dem Kontext gebraucht werden, wo es darum geht, dass etwas ausschließlich für die Nutzung durch eine Person oder einen Personenkreis gedacht ist. So wird das Gebot in *Dtn* 17:18-20, dass ein König sich eine Abschrift der Tora schreiben und konsultieren soll, dahingehend ausgelegt, dass jeder einzelne König eine solche Tora für sich anfertigen und sie allein für sich nutzen darf, aber nicht die seiner Vorgänger: **שְׁלֹא יִהְיֶה נְאוֹת בְּשָׁל אֲבוֹתָיו אֵלָּא בְּשָׁלוֹ** (*tSan* 4,7 (25)).

Von hierher erklären sich auch die Stellen, an denen **אֹרֶת** Nif'al erscheint, ohne dass dort der persönliche Nutzen des Subjekts im Vordergrund steht. Es ist dabei jeweils von Objekten die Rede, die speziell für eine Gruppe zur Durchführung ihrer Aufgabe gedacht oder per se im persönlichen Gebrauch sind. Ersteres ist der Fall in *tŠeq* 2,6, wo die Gerätschaften, die die Priester im Tempel brauchen, als solche bezeichnet werden, die die Priester für sich – d.h. für ihre priesterliche Tätigkeit – nutzen. (26) Letzteres begegnet z.B. im

(20) Gerade der Kontext von *tŠeq* 3,4 macht deutlich, dass es hier um den Nutzen „für sich“ bzw. für Zwecke, die der Handelnde selbst bestimmt, geht.

(21) Dass hier nicht einfach gemeint ist, dass die Priester die Haut benutzen dürfen, sondern dass sie sie für sich benutzen dürfen, macht der Kontext von *mZeb* 12,4 deutlich, in dem es darum geht, wann die Häute den Priestern gehören.

(22) Vgl. *jEr* 22b; *jAZ* 39c; *bBer* 53b; *GenR* 3,6; *Sof* 20,2; *Tanḥ Wayyigaš* 6.

(23) Als Beispiel nennt *jBer* 12c unter anderem den Fall, dass es dafür ausreicht, dass eine Frau spinnen kann.

(24) Vgl. auch den kleinen Traktat *Mezuza* 1,4.

(25) Vgl. *Sifre Dtn* 160; *jSan* 20c; *bSan* 21a hat hierfür **נָאָה** (Wilna: נאה) Hitpael, dass den Aspekt des (negativen) Eigennutzes einbringt.

(26) **הַסִּירוֹת וְהַיַּעֲוִים וְהַמְזוּמָּרוֹת וְהַמְזוּרָקוֹת וְכָלֵים שֶׁהַכֹּהֲנִים נֹאֲתִין בָּהֶן**.

Kontext von Festtagsgeboten zur Bezeichnung von Dingen, die man an einem Festtag schicken darf: „Was auch immer man am Festtag selbst benutzen könnte, darf man schicken“ (*mBeṣ* 1,10 (27)).

Dass אור Nif'al aber selbst noch im amoräischen Hebräischen (und hier insbesondere in Palästina) die Konnotation einer Handlung hat, die dem Handelnden dahingehend „nutzt“, dass sie ihm Befriedigung bringt, macht der euphemistische Gebrauch für eine zum Orgasmus führende sexuelle Betätigung deutlich. So findet sich im Kontext der halachischen Beurteilung von Ejakulaten die Phrase ראה עצמו נראה בחלום „er sah sich selbst in einem Traum für sich selbst befriedigend handelnd“. (28)

Auswertung

Auf Grund der Beobachtungen zum mittelhebräischen Gebrauch von אור Nif'al ergibt sich folgendes Bild:

Die Wurzel bezeichnet eine Handlung, die dem Interesse einer Person dient, zu ihren Gunsten geschieht oder ihr adäquat ist. Dieser Aspekt ist offenkundig unlösbar mit der Wurzel verbunden, so dass die reflexive Konnotation des Nif'als sich auf diesen bezieht und entsprechend den Nutzen bzw. das Interesse des Handelnden selbst zum Ausdruck bringt.

Von hieraus wird der Gebrauch der Wurzel in *Gen* 34 und 2 *Kön* 12 verständlich. In beiden Fällen bezeichnet es offenkundig eine Handlung, die dem Interesse eines anderen dient, wobei dies als Wunsch oder Vorschlag geäußert wurde. So sollte man in *Gen* 34:15, 22 und 23 die Phrase ל אור im Sinne von „im Interesse des... handeln“ verstehen, während man in 2 *Kön* 12:9 das isolierte אור mit „wunschgemäß handeln“ wiedergeben kann. Zugleich wird deutlich, dass in beiden Texten Qal vorliegt.

Als Grundbedeutung für אור ergibt sich damit, dass es eine Handlung bezeichnet, die erwünscht oder nutz- bzw. interessenorientiert ist. Dabei eignet der Wurzel selbst nur die Konnotation der Nützlichkeit oder des Erwünscht-Seins. Für wen konkret dies gilt, ist entweder kontextuell zu bestimmen – etwa in der Angabe mit ל und/oder durch den Gebrauch nach einer Wunschäußerung – oder ergibt sich durch die im Nif'al morphologisch realisierte Konnotation der Reflexivität.

(27) כָּל שְׁנֹאוֹתָיו בּוֹ בַּיּוֹם טוֹב מִשְׁלַחַן אוֹתוֹ aufgenommen in *jŠab* 7d; *jBeṣ* 61a; *bBeṣ* 15a. In diesen Kontext gehört auch *mŠabb* 3,6, wo von Öl die Rede ist, das am Sabbat aus einer Lampe getropft ist. Am Sabbat darf man dies nicht nutzen (אין נִיאוֹתִים מִמֶּנּוּ).

(28) *jBer* 6,c; *jJoma* 44d; *jTaan* 64c. Dabei geht es nicht um Selbstbefriedigung, wie die dort zitierte Ansicht einiger Rabbinen zeigt, dass dies nur für einen Traum von einem Beischlaf mit einer Frau gelte.

אות in der Damaskusschrift

Es stellt sich nun die Frage, inwieweit die beiden Belege von **אות** in der *Damaskusschrift* in dieses Bedeutungsfeld, das von den benachbarten Sprachstufen aufgespannt wird, eingeordnet werden können.

Beide stehen im Kontext der Regelung zum Ausschluss eines Gruppenmitgliedes und beschreiben das Verhalten desjenigen, der offenkundig sich nicht von dem fernhält, der ausgeschlossen wurde. So bestimmt *CD XX 7*, dass man mit demjenigen (**עמו**), dessen Untaten offiziell bekannt geworden sind und zu seinem (zeitweiligen) Ausschluss geführt haben, nicht **אות** machen darf in Bezug auf Besitz (**בהון**) und/oder Arbeit/Dienst (**בעבודה**): **אל יאות איש עמו בהון ובעבודה**.

Die nächste Parallele zu der Verbindung von **הון** und **עבודה** findet sich in *CD X 18-20* (|| *4Q270 frag. 6 v 4*) und *4Q264a frag. 1,6-7*, wo unter anderem die Beschäftigung mit rechtlichen Fragen des Besitzes (**הון**) sowie mit der eigenen Arbeit (**עבודה**) am Sabbat verboten wird. So wie dort **הון** und **עבודה** als ökonomische Begriffe gebraucht werden, dürfte diese Konnotation auch in *CD XX 7* vorliegen. Dies passt gut zu dem oben gewonnenen Ergebnis, dass **אות** ein Handeln bezeichnet, das sich am Nutzen oder den Interessen einer der beteiligten Personen orientiert. Mithin hat *CD XX* den ökonomischen Aspekt der Nutznießung im Umgang mit dem Ausgeschlossenen im Blick. Jedoch bleibt zu fragen, ob *CD XX* den Besitz und die Arbeit(skraft) des Ausgeschlossenen meint, deren Nutznießung verboten wird, oder die des Gemeinschaftsmitgliedes, die dann nicht in Gemeinschaft mit dem Ausgeschlossenen gewinnbringend eingesetzt werden dürfen. Oder will der Autor dadurch, dass er den konkreten Bezug von **הון** und **עבודה** zu den Beteiligten offen lässt, zum Ausdruck bringen, dass jeglicher ökonomischer Kontakt, der auf den Nutzen eines oder beider Personen ausgerichtet ist, zwischen einem Ausgeschlossenen und einen Mitglied der Gemeinschaft zu unterlassen ist?

Eine Antwort auf diese Frage ergibt sich durch einen Blick auf den Kontext des zweiten Beleges in *4Q266 frag. 11,14-15*. Dieser legt fest, dass auch derjenige, der mit (**עם**) einem Ausgeschlossenen **אות** macht, ebenfalls die Gemeinschaft verlassen muss. Dabei wird die Phrase **עם אות עם** zwar nicht wie in *CD XX* am Schluss erweitert, aber ihr geht eine recht eindeutige Beschreibung des Subjekts voraus:

ויצא המשתלח והאיש | אשר יוכל מהונם ואשר ידרוש שלומו המשתלח (29) ואשר יאות עמו

(29) Wohl so statt **המשתלח** zu lesen, vgl. auch Joosten (Anm. 1) 222; Wacholder (Anm. 8) 106. Von einem einleitenden **ו**, das z.B. Baumgarten in *DJD XVIII* annimmt, ist nicht nur auf *PAM 43.277* und *42.390* keine Spur zu erkennen (der dunkle Fleck vor dem Wort ist ein Loch, dessen Leder nach links umgeklappt ist), sondern es fehlt auch der Platz für ein **ו**, will man nicht annehmen, dass hier der Wortabstand ungewöhnlich knapp ausgefallen ist.

„Und es verlässt (die Gemeinschaft) der, der weggeschickt worden ist,
und derjenige, der von ihrem (30) Besitz sich ernährt
und der sein Wohlergehen sucht,
~~der, der weggeschickt worden ist,~~
und der אִית mit ihm macht.“

Das Verhalten dieser Person hat folglich zwei komplementäre Aspekte: Zum einen könnte er auf Kosten der Übertreter leben oder anderweitig aus ihrem Eigentum Nutzen ziehen, zum anderen könnte er für das Wohlergehen des Ausgeschlossenen tätig werden, worunter wohl in erster Linie Handlungen zu verstehen sind, die diesem nutzen.

Eine enge Parallele hat dies in *CD VI 14-VII 1*. Nach diesem Abschnitt soll man sich von den Verworfenen trennen und von gottlosem Besitz fernhalten (ולֹהֲנוֹר מִהֶן הָרָשָׁעָה), der durch Frevel oder Ausbeutung erlangt wurde (*VI 15-16*). Dagegen gehört zur Ethik der Gemeinschaftsglieder nicht nur, einander zu lieben, die Armen, Bedürftigen und Fremden zu unterstützen, sondern auch das Wohlergehen des Genossen zu suchen (וּלְדַרוֹשׁ אִישׁ אֶת שְׁלוֹמֵ אַחֵיהֶוּ), *VI 20-VII 1*).

4Q266 spricht sich folglich sowohl dagegen aus, dass ein Mitglied der Gemeinschaft Nutznießer eines Ausgestossenen ist, d.h. sich vom Besitz der auszuschließenden Gesetzesübertreter ernährt, was nach der Terminologie von *CD VI* man als frevelhaften Besitz bezeichnen könnte, als auch dagegen, dass das Mitglied dem Ausgestossenen zu Nutzen wäre – sich für das Wohlergehen eines anderen einzusetzen, kommt nach *CD VI-VII* ja nur den Gemeinschaftsgliedern zu.

Es ist anzunehmen, dass *CD XX* derselbe Gedanke zu Grunde liegt und mithin die oben gestellte Frage dahingehend zu beantworten ist, dass der Autor mit seiner unspezifischen Ausdrucksweise eben jegliches ökonomisches Handeln, das dem Ausgestossenen oder seinem in der Gemeinschaft verbliebenen Partner Nutzen brächte, verbieten will. Dabei kommt aber weder diese Zweiseitigkeit noch der Aspekt des Nutzens in der Phrase בָּהֶן וּבְעִבּוּדָה zum Ausdruck. Angesichts des Ergebnisses jedoch, dass אִית eine Handlung bezeichnet, die am Interesse oder Nutzen eines Beteiligten orientiert ist, ist dies auch nicht nötig – der Aspekt des Nutzens wird eben schon durch den Gebrauch der Wurzel אִית deutlich. Zugleich erklärt sich die in den anderen Textkorpora nicht begegnende Verbindung von אִית mit עָם: Während auch in der *Damaskusschrift* wie in den rabbinischen Texten die sachlichen Objekte, auf die sich das Handeln bezieht, mit ב eingeleitet werden, kann natürlich der Handlungspartner hier nicht – wie in *Gen 34:15, 22, 23* – mit ל angeführt werden. *Gen 34* zeigt,

(30) Derer, die die von Gott gesetzten Grenzen übertreten und daher verflucht sind und ausgeschlossen werden sollen, vgl. *Z. 12-14*.

dass eine solche Konstruktion das Handeln zugunsten oder im Interesse *des Gegenüber* zum Ausdruck bringen würde. Ziel der Aussagen in der *Damaskusschrift* ist aber, jegliches einem oder beiden Beteiligten nützliches ökonomisches Handeln auszuschließen. Folglich wird hier – analog etwa zu *עם עשה עם* – *עם* im Sinne von „mit, in Bezug auf, an (jmd. handeln)“ gewählt. Entsprechend ist *יאות* als Qal in der allgemeinen Bedeutung „nutz-/interessenorientiert handeln“ zu interpretieren. So ergibt sich die Aussage, dass man mit einem Ausgeschlossenen in keinerlei ökonomisches Verhältnis – sei es hinsichtlich Besitz oder Arbeit – treten darf, das auf irgendeinen ökonomischen Nutzen zieht – sei es für sich selbst oder für den Ausgeschlossenen. Man hat also jegliche Handlung zu unterlassen, bei der man vom Besitz des anderen profitieren oder seinem Wohlergehen nützlich sein könnte, wie man es unter Aufnahme von 4Q266 auch formulieren könnte.

Zugleich wird auch verständlich, wieso in 4Q266 frag. 11,15 diese Aussage mit einem einfachen *עמו יאות* ohne jede weitere Ergänzung abgeschlossen werden kann. *אות* Qal + *עם* bedeutet eben schon für sich genommen „mit jemandem nutzorientiert umgehen“, was durchaus eine allgemeine Beschreibung insbesondere ökonomischer Beziehungen zueinander darstellt, die per se nutz- oder interessenorientiert sind.

Letztendlich nicht zu entscheiden ist aber, ob dort *יאות עמו* und *והאיש אשר יוכל מהונם ואשר ידרוש שלומו* gehört und somit dessen Einzelangaben zusammenfasst, oder ob das Nebeneinander dieser beiden Formulierungen sich einer nachträglichen Verknüpfung zweier Textversionen bzw. der Einfügung einer paraphrasierenden Glosse verdankt; dabei wäre dann aber eine solche Glosse in *והאיש אשר יוכל מהונם ואשר ידרוש שלומו* zu sehen. Für eine solche Textgeschichte könnte die nachträglich getilgte Wiederholung des *המשתלח* (31) vor *יאות עמו* sprechen, die zwar dem *המשתלח* vor *והאיש אשר יוכל מהונם ואשר ידרוש שלומו* entspricht, aber inhaltlich hier einen Überschuss bildet. De facto aber lassen sich *המשתלח והאיש אשר יוכל מהונם ואשר ידרוש שלומו* und *המשתלח ואשר יאות עמו* als zwei Versionen ein und derselben Aussage verstehen, die eben dann entweder aus verschiedenen Quellen hier zusammengeführt wurden, oder bei der die längere Version nichts anderes als eine Paraphrase der kürzeren ist, die fälschlicherweise in den Text geraten ist. (32)

(31) Zur Lesung vgl. Anm. 29.

(32) Mit E. Tov, *Scribal Practices and Approaches Reflected in the Texts Found in the Judean Desert* (STDJ 54: Leiden, 2004), 203, ist eine vertikale Dittographie hier aber auch nicht völlig auszuschließen. Es ist aber zu beachten, dass die nachträgliche Tilgung des Wortes wahrscheinlich nicht vom Schreiber der Rolle selbst durchgeführt wurde. Dieser scheut sich nicht, überflüssige Wörter recht kräftig so auszustreichen, dass ihre Identifizierung schon Mühe machen kann (vgl. etwa Frag. 1a 22; 6 i c 1; 11,16), oder mit gleich zwei Strichen (vgl. z.B. frag. 5 ii 13). Im vorlie-

Wie dem auch sei, als Zwischenergebnis bleibt festzuhalten, dass der Gebrauch von אֹת in den angeführten Texten der CD-Tradition sich problemlos in das semantische Feld einordnen lässt, das auf Grund der biblischen und rabbinischen Belege zu bestimmen ist. אֹת begegnet in unseren Texten also nicht mit einer speziellen Bedeutung, deren Entwicklung etwa mit Jan Joosten auf eine besondere Auslegungstradition von Gen 34 zurückzuführen wäre.

Dennoch stellt sich die Frage, wie der Befund zu klären ist, dass einerseits in ähnlichen Aussagen in Qumran ערב Hitpa'el begegnet, andererseits einige Targumtraditionen ebenfalls ערב im 'Itpa'al zur Wiedergabe von אֹת in Gen 34 verwenden. Um diese Frage zu beantworten, soll zunächst das Verhältnis der ערב-Aussagen in Qumran zu den verwandten אֹת-Stellen untersucht und schließlich ein Blick auf die fraglichen Targumtraditionen geworfen werden.

ערב Hitpa'el und אֹת in Qumran

Schon ein erster Blick auf die Stellen in IQS, die ערב Hitpa'el in ähnlichen Kontexten wie אֹת in der *Damaskusschrift* aufweisen, ergibt neben Übereinstimmungen signifikante Abweichungen. So ordnet IQS VII 24-25 zwar ebenfalls die Verstoßung eines Menschen an, der sich seinerseits nicht von einem Verstossenen trennt, beschreibt diesen aber mit folgenden Worten

ואיש מאנשי היח[ד] אשר יתערב | עמו בטהרתו או בהונו

„Und jemand von den Leuten der Gemeinschaft, der sich mit ihm einlässt in Bezug auf seine Reinheit oder auf seinen Besitz...“

Nach IQS VIII besteht die Bestrafung eines vorsätzlichen Sünders darin, dass man ihn fortschickt und er nicht wieder zurückkehren darf

ולוא יתערב איש מאנשי הקודש בהונו ועם עצתו לכל | דבר

„und keiner von den Leuten der Heiligkeit darf sich einlassen auf seinen Besitz oder mit seinem Rat in Bezug auf irgendeine Angelegenheit.“ (Z. 23-24)

Der weitere Kontext macht deutlich, was mit „sich einlassen... mit seinem Rat“ gemeint ist. So bestimmen Z. 24-25 als Urteil gegen den, der aus Versehen gefehlt hat, dass „er von der Reinheit und dem Rat abgesondert werde“ (והובדל מן הטהרה ומן העצה) und er für zwei Jahre niemanden richten und auch in keiner Angelegenheit um Rat gefragt werden darf (ולוא ישאל על כל עצה). Die Anordnung, ihn von

genden Fall wurde das Wort mit einem sehr dünnen Strich umrahmt (ähnlich frag. 1a 22) und mit einem so schwachen Strich durchgestrichen, dass er mehrfach unterbrochen und auch nur in den letzten Zeichen auszumachen ist. War sich der Korrektor nicht sicher, ob das Wort wirklich gelöscht werden sollte, weil er den Text aus einer anderen Rezension so oder ähnlich kannte?

der Reinheit abzusondern, korrespondiert dabei mit dem Verbot in VII 24-25, sich mit einem Verstossenen im Hinblick auf seine Reinheit einzulassen. Es kann wohl kaum bezweifelt werden, dass dort „seine Reinheit“ sich auf das Mitglied der Gemeinschaft bezieht und nicht auf den wegen seines Frevels Ausgestossenen, der nach VIII 24 ja von der Reinheit (der Gemeinde) abgesondert werden soll. Mithin steht in VII 24-25 nicht eine Absonderung von dem Ausgestossenen im Hinblick auf den Besitz oder anderer ökonomischer Nutzen im Mittelpunkt des Interesses, sondern an erster Stelle die Vermeidung eines Kontaktes, der die Reinheit der verbleibenden Mitglieder tangiert. Und auch in VIII 23-24 ist der ökonomische Aspekt nur ein Teilaspekt neben dem explizit angeführten Aspekt, dass man den Rat des Verstossenen meiden soll. Aber auch hier steht offenkundig der Reinheitsgedanke im Hintergrund, wofür nicht nur die oben genannte Fortsetzung der Bestimmung spricht, sondern auch die Bezeichnung **אנשי הקודש**, die an dieser Stelle offenkundig den kultisch relevanten Unterschied zwischen den Mitgliedern der Gemeinschaft und dem Ausgestossenen betont. Dem entspricht, dass in *IQS* V 13.18-20 der Begriff **איש אנשי הקודש** im Kontext der Frage von Reinheit begegnet.

Mithin spielt im Gegensatz zu 4Q266 frag. 11 und CD XX der ökonomische Aspekt des Besitzes in den Belegstellen aus *IQS* keine zentrale Rolle – und erst recht nicht der Gedanke, dass man daraus Nutzen ziehen könnte. Umgekehrt spielt das kultische Motiv der Reinheit in den entsprechenden Anordnungen der Damaskusschrift keine Rolle. (33)

Man erkennt also einen signifikanten Unterschied des motivlichen Hintergrundes beider Traditionen: in der Sektenregel ist es der Gedanke, dass der Ausgestossene als unrein gilt, so dass jeder Kontakt mit ihm zu vermeiden ist. Dem entspricht auch der Gebrauch von **ערב** *Hitpa'el* in *IQS* VI 16-17, wonach ein Eintretender erst nach einem Jahr der Prüfung die Reinheit (**טהרה**) der Vollmitglieder berühren und an deren Besitz teilhaben darf (**יתערב בהן הרבים**). Diese Bestimmung ist komplementär zu der des Ausschlusses in *IQS* VII und VIII und auch hier begegnen dieselben Motive und Begriffe. Die enge Verbindung, die **ערב** *Hitpa'el* gerade in der Konnotation des „Sich-Einlassen mit jemanden, d.h. in Kontakt mit ihm kommen“ zu dem Aspekt der Verunreinigung in Qumran hat, erhellt z.B. auch aus 4Q274 frag. 1 i 5, wo der verunreinigende Umgang einer blutflüssigen Frau mit jemand anderen durch diesen Ausdruck bezeichnet wird. *IQS* bedient sich hier also einer geprägten Terminologie.

(33) Vgl. auch die Beobachtungen von Murphy (Anm. 10), die zu dem Ergebnis kommt, dass zwar sowohl die *Damaskusschrift* als auch *IQS* ein grosses Interesse an Fragen des Eigentums haben, aber erstere dies insbesondere aus einer sozial-ökonomischen Perspektive betrachtet, letztere aber vom Ideal einer neuen Gemeinschaft auf der Grundlage des Bundes ausgeht (162), wobei hier unter anderem das Motiv einer heiligen Einheit und des kultischen Opfers eine wesentliche Rolle spielt (161).

Die CD-Tradition rekurriert aber eben nicht auf diesen motivlichen Hintergrund der Reinheit, sondern auf das Motiv des ökonomischen Nutzens, der im Handeln gegenüber dem Ausgestossenen liegen könnte. Wahrscheinlich greift sie dabei eine ältere weisheitliche Tradition auf. So spricht offenbar ein Spruch des Ahiqar davon, dass ein guter Mensch, der die böse Tat eines anderen erkennt oder sieht, mit diesem keinen ökonomischen Kontakt mehr haben wird. (34) Zu diesem motivlichen Hintergrund passt perfekt der Gebrauch von אֹת, das den Nutzen oder das Interesse konnotiert, aus dem heraus eine Handlung geschieht. Mithin wurde אֹת hier nicht als Synonym für ערב Hitpa'el verwendet, sondern bewusst für die besondere Aussageintention des Kontextes gewählt. Beide Termini erscheinen in den unterschiedlichen Kontexten in ihrer jeweiligen spezifischen und voneinander unterschiedlichen Gebrauchsweise.

Die Gemeinsamkeit zwischen beiden Traditionen liegt aber darin, dass einerseits der ökonomische Aspekt des (gemeinsam genutzten) Besitzes als ein wesentlicher Aspekt der Verbindung zwischen den Mitgliedern der Gemeinschaft bzw. des unerwünschten Kontaktes zu einem Außenseiter gesehen wird, (35) andererseits hierfür dieselbe Terminologie für diesen Besitz – הֶון (und עֲבוּדָה) – gebraucht wird. Dies illustriert, dass beide Traditionen trotz ihrer jeweils eigenen Ausprägung sich einer gruppeninternen Terminologie bedient haben, sie aber variierten. Dabei lässt diese Terminologie auch noch weitere Varianten zu. So ist das negative Pendant zum Abstandhalten gegenüber dem Sünder nach IQS V 14 das „sich nicht verbinden mit ihm in Bezug auf seine Arbeit und seinen Besitz“: לֹא יִיחַד עִמּוֹ: בְּעִבּוּדָה וּבְהוֹנוֹ אֶל יְאוֹת אִישׁ, was bis auf das Prädikat nahezu wörtlich אִישׁ יְאוֹת וּבְעִבּוּדָה עִמּוֹ בְּהֶון in CD XX 7 entspricht. Und IQS IX 8 verbietet die Verbindung des Gemeinschaftsbesitzes mit dem Besitz trügerischer Leute unter Gebrauch von ערב und הֶון: אֵל יִתְעַרֵב הוֹנֵם עִם הֶון אָנְשִׁי: הֶון, was insbesondere IQS VII 24-25 und VIII 23-24 variiert.

ערב 'Itpa'al und אֹת in Gen 34

Wenn somit in der qumranischen Tradition אֹת und ערב Hitpa'el nicht einfach als Synonyme gebraucht werden oder austauschbar sind, sondern die jeweils besondere Aussageintention der Kontexte widerspiegeln, so stellt sich abschließend die Frage nach dem Verhältnis von aramäisch ערב 'Itpa'al und hebräisch אֹת in einigen Targumin zu Gen 34.

So gibt Targum Neofiti I in Gen 34:15,22,23 MT נְאוֹת(ה)/יָאוֹת ל mit נִתְעַרְבִ/אֶתְעַרְבוּ ל wieder. Dem entspricht eine palästinische Targum-

(34) Vgl. Ah VII 5-6 (= Cowley 163-164/TAD C1.1 99-100); zum Text vgl. Verf., *Die Sprache der Ahiqarsprüche* (BZAW 194: Berlin, 1990), 10.17.

(35) Dies ist bei einer Gemeinschaft, die die Idee des Gemeinschaftseigentums praktiziert, sicher nicht überraschend.

tradition, die im Ms. C aus der Kairoer Genizah belegt ist, (36) aber nur in V. 22 יִתְעַרְבּוּן עִמָּן bietet. Dagegen hat sie in V. 15 und 23 נִשְׁתָּה לְהוֹן bzw. נִשְׁתָּה לְכֹן, was der samaritanischen Targumtradition entspricht, die in V. 15, 22 und 23 ein ʾItpeʿal von שוה mit folgendem ל aufweist. Der Gebrauch von שוה in diesem Kontext beruht auf der (nicht nur) im Aramäischen belegten Konnotation der Wurzel im Sinne von „sich (im Hinblick auf eine Sache) angleichen“ > „übereinstimmen, zustimmen“. (37)

Offenkundig liegt aber mit שוה eine alte palästinisch-aramäische (38) Interpretation von אֹרֶת in *Gen* 34 vor, die schon den LXX-Übersetzer beeinflusst hat. Nur so erklärt sich, dass die LXX in *Gen* 34 an allen drei Stellen das auf den ersten Blick verwunderliche Passiv von ὁμοῖο im Sinne von „gleich (gemacht) werden“ aufweist – eine durchaus treffende (wenn auch nicht an diesen Stellen!) Übersetzung von aramäisch שוה im t-Stamm. (39)

Die Interpretation von אֹרֶת mit der Wurzel שוה war aber inhaltlich nicht unproblematisch. Von ihr aus konnte *Gen* 34:15,22,23 auch dahingehend missverstanden werden, dass die Sippe Jakobs und die Sichemiten sich *einander* angleichen sollten, was der Intention des Textes widerspricht. Dieser erwartet eine Angleichung nur von den Sichemiten, die sich beschneiden lassen sollen (V. 15.22). So verwundert es nicht, dass auch spätere palästinische Targumisten eine bessere Lösung suchten. Dabei darf als erste erhaltene Stufe die Version des Ms. C aus der Kairoer Genizah gelten, die zunächst in V. 22 statt שוה das ʾItpaʿal von ערב einsetzt. Dass dies ausgerechnet in diesem Vers zuerst geschah, liegt wohl darin begründet, dass gerade hier die Gleichheitsaussage syntaktisch eng in einem Satz mit dem Motiv verbunden ist, ein Volk zu werden. Dieses ist seinerseits mit dem Vorschlag aus V. 9 verbunden, dass man sich durch Heirat miteinander versippen solle (vgl. V. 16). Und so dürfte der Gebrauch von ערב ʾItpaʿal in V. 22 kaum von der sprachlich unauffälligen und verbreiteten Wiedergabe von MT וְהִתְחַוּ „sich verschwägern“ in V. 9 mit ערב ʾItpaʿal in der Bedeutung „sich versippen“ (40) zu trennen sein.

(36) Vgl. die Edition in M.L. Klein, *Genizah Manuscripts of Palestinian Targum to the Pentateuch* (I, Cincinnati, 1986).

(37) Vgl. schon TAD B2 11,2-3 im juristischen Kontext כְּחֵדָה אֲשֶׁתוֹן | כְּחֵדָה „Wir haben uns geeinigt/sind übereingekommen“ (anders TAD: „we have acted as equals“, vgl. aber J. Hoftijzer – K. Jongeling, *Dictionary of the North-West Semitic Inscriptions* [HO I 21,2: Leiden, 1995], 1117; K. Beyer, *Die aramäischen Texte vom Toten Meer*, ([Göttingen, 1984], 704.) Diese Bedeutungsnuance findet sich dann auch in den späteren Dialekten in den verschiedenen Stämmen. Der juristische Gebrauch ist z.B. auch im ʾEthpeʿel im Syrischen im Kontext von Kauf/Verkauf belegt.

(38) Dagegen hat Onkelos, Pseudo-Jonatan und Peschitta hier Formen von פִּסֵּס.

(39) Vgl. auch T. Muraoka, *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Louvain – Paris – Dudley, MA, 2002), 405b.

(40) Vgl. Ms. C, Neofiti I, Pseudo-Jonatan und einige samaritanische Targumtexte.

Neofiti I repräsentiert dann eine spätere Stufe, in der dieses ערב 'Itpa'al dann die Formen von שוה auch in V. 15 und 23 verdrängt hat. Damit ergibt sich zusammenfassend folgendes wahrscheinliche Bild der Entwicklung der Wiedergabe von אִוֵּת in Gen 34 in der palästinischen Tragumtradition:

- (a) V. 15.22.23 = שוה (vgl. samaritanische Targumtradition, LXX)
- > (b) V. 15.23 = שוה, aber V. 22 = ערב (< V. 9; Ms. C)
- > (c) V. 15.22.23 = ערב (Neofiti 1)

In jedem Fall dürfte deutlich sein, dass ערב 'Itpa'al in diesen Versen wie in V. 9 im Sinne von „sich versippen, vermischen“ zu verstehen ist (41) und damit doch in einer etwas spezielleren Bedeutung vorliegt als ערב Hitpa'el in IQS. Und wenn die oben gebotene diachrone Erklärung der palästinischen Targumtraditionen zutrifft, so ist sein Gebrauch in Gen 34:15,22,23 als Wiedergabe von hebräisch אִוֵּת erst das Ergebnis einer späteren Entwicklung, die ihrerseits jedoch völlig aus Gen 34 (insbesondere aus 34:9) ableitbar ist. Mit- hin gibt es keine direkte Verbindung zwischen dem Wechsel von אִוֵּת und ערב Hitpa'el in Qumran, der sich aus unterschiedlichen Aussage- tendenzen erklärt, und der Wiedergabe von אִוֵּת mit ערב 'Itpa'al in ei- nigen palästinischen Targumtraditionen, die in irgendeiner Weise die Semantik von אִוֵּת in den qumranischen Texten beeinflusst hätte kön- nen. Eine kritische Durchsicht des Gebrauches dieses Lexems zeigt hingegen, dass sich auch die qumranischen Belege problemlos in das allgemeine Bedeutungsfeld der hebräischen Wurzel einordnen lassen und daher keinen Einfluss einer besonderen exegetischen Tradition erkennen läßt.

Ingo KOTTSIEPER

(41) So z.B. auch M.L. Klein (Anm. 36) 68.70; M. McNamara, *Targum Neo- fiti 1: Genesis* (The Aramaic Bible 14: 1992), 162-163. Anders M. Sokoloff, *A Dictionary of Jewish Palestinian Aramaic of the Byzantine Period* (Ramat Gan, 2002), s.v. ערב 3#, der das Wort sowohl in Ms. C als auch Neofiti I in V. 15, 22 und 23, nicht aber in V. 9, als 'Itpa'al von ערב in der Bedeutung „to be pleasing“ ableiten will. Aber nicht nur die Bildung mit עם in Ms. C und die Identität der Phrasen mit ihrem Gebrauch in V. 9 passt besser zur Ableitung von ערב in der Bedeutung „vermischen, verbinden“, 'Itpa'al „vermischt, versippt sein/werden“ (bei Sokoloff ערב 1#), sondern auch die Tatsache, dass ein 'Itpa'al oder ähnlicher Stamm von ערב 3# nicht belegt ist und die Wurzel zudem ein seltenes hebräisches Lehnwort im palästinischen Aramäischen darstellt.

DUALISM IN THE VISIONS OF AMRAM*

ONE OF THE central characteristics of the sectarian scrolls from Qumran lies in their all-inclusive dualistic view of the world. The celebrated section known as the “Treatise of the Two Spirits” in *IQS* III–IV represents a prominent example of this thoroughgoing dualistic perspective. (1) According to the *Rule of the Community*, the universe is divided into two realms controlled by two Spirits, the Spirit of Light and the Spirit of Darkness. These two Spirits rule over the “Sons of Light” and the “Sons of Darkness” respectively. Each of these latter groups is similarly ruled by an Angel – the “Prince of Light” and the “Prince of Darkness.” Further dualistic descriptions occur in other sectarian compositions, such as the *War Scroll* (*IQM*) col. I (2), *4QCatena*^a (*4Q177*) frgs. 12–13 col. I, (3) and *4QCurses* (*4Q280*). (4)

The library at Qumran contains many texts written in a style and characterized by a set of ideas and terms that differ from the literature attributed to the sectarian community. It is noteworthy that these

* This article was written as part of a research project entitled “The Patriarchs and the Book of Genesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls,” directed by Profs. Devorah Dimant (Haifa) and Reinhard Kratz (Göttingen) and funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

(1) See E. Qimron and J.H. Charlesworth, “Rule of the Community,” in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation. Vol. 1: Rule of the Community and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: John Knox, 1994), 14–19.

(2) See J. Duhaime, “War Scroll,” *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation. Vol. 2: Damascus Document, War Scroll and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: John Knox, 1995), 96–99.

(3) See J. Milgrom, “Catena A”, in *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic and Greek Texts with English Translation, Vol. 6B: Pesharim, Other Commentaries and Related Documents* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck/Louisville: John Knox, 2002), 296–97.

(4) See B. Nitzan, “4QCurses,” in *Qumran Cave 4, XX: Poetical and Liturgical Texts, Part 2* (DJD XXIX; ed. E. Chazon et al.; Oxford: Clarendon, 1999), 1–8.

compositions are not informed by a dualistic perspective, although some contain individual dualistic elements without exhibiting a systematic dualistic framework. While much has been written on the dualism characteristic of the sectarian literature, (5) much less discussion has been devoted to the dualistic elements found within the non-sectarian texts, especially the Aramaic documents. (6) This study hopes to rectify this circumstance in modest form by examining the *Visions of Amram*, which form part of the Aramaic testamentary literature from Qumran. (7)

(5) For recent general studies, see J. Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library: Reflection on their Background and History," in *Legal Texts and Legal Issues: Proceedings of the Second Meeting of the International Organization for Qumran Studies, Cambridge 1995* (STJD 23; ed. M. Bernstein, F. García Martínez, and J. Kampen; Leiden: Brill, 1997), 275–335; M. Kister, "On Good and Evil: The Theological Foundation of the Qumran Community," *The Qumran Scrolls and Their World* (ed. M. Kister; Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, 2009), 2:497–528 (Hebrew). Frey emphasizes the fact that the sectarian dualistic ideology displays significant differences on the basis of which the texts may be distinguished from one another, suggesting a classification of the dualistic perception of sectarian literature according to four categories: cosmic dualism, spatial dualism, eschatological dualism, and ethical dualism. Kister disputes this framework, arguing that, despite the fact that the sectarian literature does not exhibit a coherent theological perspective, cosmic dualism is indistinguishable from ethical and/or eschatological dualism, since the ideas which inform each type are so closely intertwined. In his view, the sectarian literature reflects the concept of a linkage between the evil regnant in the world and that embedded in human nature.

(6) A limited number of discussions of the dualist outlook(s) exhibited by the non-sectarian, including Aramaic, compositions within the Qumran library is available: see D. Dimant, "Dualism at Qumran: New Perspective," in *Caves of Enlightenment: Proceedings of the American School of Oriental Research – Dead Sea Scrolls Jubilee Symposium* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; North Richland Hills: Bibal Press, 1998), 55–73; Frey, "Different Patterns of Dualistic Thought in the Qumran Library," 316–22. Dimant argues that the dualistic phraseology found in the book of *Jubilees*, 1 *Enoch*, and the Aramaic texts from Qumran reflects the belief that demons are impure and malevolent spirits who inflict sickness and disease upon sinners, further suggesting the prevalence of a relationship between the presence of demons and the notion of darkness in both the sectarian and non-sectarian writings from Qumran. Frey maintains that cosmic dualism originated in pre-Essene priestly circles, including the *Aramaic Levi Document* (1Q21, 4Q213–214 and 4Q540–541), the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542), and the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–548) in this category.

(7) For testamentary literature, see D. Dimant, "The Testament as a Literary Form in Early Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature," in *Proceedings of the Eighth World Congress of Jewish Studies* (Jerusalem, August 16–21, 1981, [1982]), 79–83; idem, "Old Testament Pseudepigrapha at Qumran," in *The Bible and The Dead Sea Scrolls. Vol. 2: The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Qumran Community* (ed. J.H. Charlesworth; Waco, Texas: Baylor University Press, 2006), 447–67. In his early publication of the *Visions of Amram*, Milik classified the composition as belonging to the testamentary genre, being followed in this view by Kobelski and Puech: J.T. Milik, "4QVisions de 'Amram et un citation d'Origène," *RB* 79 (1972), 77; P.J. Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa* (CBQMS 10; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981), 24; E. Puech, "4QVisions de Amram ar^{a-g}," *Qumran grotte 4, XXII: Textes araméens, première partie: 4Q529–549* (DJD XXXI; Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 283.

The six copies of the *Visions of Amram* (4Q543–548) comprise the visions which Amram receives and subsequently recounts to his sons on his deathbed. (8) The composition's literary genre corresponds to the Aramaic testamentary literature from Qumran and the Greek *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*. The paleographic dating assigns the earliest manuscripts to the mid-second century B.C.E. (9)

In one of the passages in the *Visions of Amram* – preserved in four copies – Amram sees a vision of two angels, one governing the domain of darkness, the other the domain of light. (10) The fullest and best-preserved of the four versions is found in 4Q544 frgs. 1–3. The full significance of this scene can only be understood in light of its context, a virtually-complete description being extrapolated from the two versions found in 4Q544 and 4Q545.

The text commences with a description of Amram's final words to his sons (4Q543 frgs. 1a–c and 2a–b // 4Q545 frg. 1a // 4Q546 frg. 1). This is followed by a depiction of the burial of Amram's fathers in Canaan – most probably his grandfather Levi and his brothers (4Q543 frgs. 3–4 // 4Q544 frg. 1:1–9 // 4Q545 frg. 1a–b:11–19 // 4Q546 frg. 2 // 4Q547 frgs. 1–2:1–8). (11) The final scene describes Amram's vision of two angels (4Q543 frgs. 5–10 // 4Q544 frg. 1:10–frg. 3 // 4Q546 frg. 4 // 4Q547 frgs. 1–2:9–13). Significantly, the sections portraying the burial of his fathers and the apparition of the angels are juxtaposed. (12)

(8) For the full *editio princeps*, see Puech, “4QVisions de Amram ar^{a-g},” 283–405. This contains 4Q549, despite the doubt regarding the propriety of its link to the *Visions of Amram*, which Puech notes. Tov and Perry's DSSR edition also includes 4Q549 as part of the *Visions of Amram*. For the question regarding whether 4Q548 should be regarded as a sixth copy of the *Visions of Amram*, see below.

(9) The paleographic dating of 4Q543, 4Q544, and 4Q547 assigns the scrolls to the second half of the second century B.C.E. 4Q545 and 4Q546 are assigned to the first half of the first century B.C.E., and 4Q548 and 4Q549 to the second half of the first century B.C.E. Puech (“4QVisions de Amram ar^{a-g},” 285) suggests that the *Visions of Amram* were composed not later than the first half of the second century B.C.E., although an earlier date in the third or even fourth century B.C.E. cannot be excluded.

(10) Parallels to this passage are preserved in 4Q543 frgs. 5–10; 4Q544 frg. 1:9–frg. 3; 4Q546 frg. 4; 4Q547 frgs. 1–2: 9–13; 4Q546 frgs. 5 and 22 possibly also belong to this passage.

(11) The Hebrew Bible contains no mention of the burial of Joseph's brothers in Canaan. A similar description of Amram's journey to and sojourn in Canaan during a military conflict between Egypt and Canaan occurs in *Jubilees* 46: see B. Halpern-Amaru, “Burying the Fathers: Exegetical Strategies and Source Traditions in *Jubilees* 46,” in *Reworking the Bible: Apocryphal and Related Texts at Qumran* (ed. E.G. Chazon et al.; STDJ 58; Leiden: Brill, 2005), 135–52; C. Werman, “The Aramaic Sources of the Book of Jubilees,” *Meghillot* 8–9 (forthcoming) (Hebrew). Werman suggests that the description in the *Visions of Amram* constitutes the source used by the author of *Jubilees*, the text in the latter (*Jubilees* 46) being reshaped as part of the writer's polemic against the anti-Semitic tendencies exhibited by Hellenistic authors.

(12) See 4Q544 frg. 1. The passage describing the burial of Amram's fathers ends at line 9, the scene of Amram's vision about the angels commencing at line 10 in the same fragment.

The description of the meeting between Amram and the two angels is detailed and vivid. Its first important feature is the occurrence of the encounter within a dream-vision (בחזוֹן חֲזוֹה דִּי חִלְמָא 4Q544 frg. 1:10). Dream-visions are a common motif in the Aramaic pseudepigraphic literature from Qumran, as well as in various contemporary apocalypses, (13) typically relating past events and prophesying future ones. Amram's dream-vision is exceptional in this regard, since it relates neither to the past nor to the future but is concerned with the present.

In the dream, Amram sees two figures striving over his own person, possibly regarding his fate (4Q544 frg. 1:10–11), giving him to understand that the world is ruled by two opposing forces. Henceforth and until the end of the scene, the text records a direct exchange between Amram and the two figures. During this conversation, the angels provide detailed answers to Amram's questions. In the first fragment, the responses come from both angels (see the first person plural "we" [אֲנִיחָא] in lines 11–12), while the second fragment contains only a single speaker – most likely the Angel of Light. The celestial beings explain that each one rules over a part of the human world (4Q544 frg. 1:12). One angel rules over all that is light, from the height to the depths (4Q544 frg. 2:16); the other, named Malchiresha, controls all the darkness filling the world (4Q544 frg. 2:13–15).

Although the description of two figures ruling over the realms of light and darkness exhibits a clearly dualistic framework, the dualism which appears in the *Visions of Amram* differs significantly from the dualistic presentation known from such sectarian compositions as *IQS* III:15–17 and *CD* II:7, XIII:12. The latter passages/scrolls exhibit an ideology combining dualism and determinism wherein the division of reality into two domains is predestined at Creation, every individual's place in one domain or the other being determined at birth.

The *Visions of Amram* diverges from this portrayal in presenting a more nuanced form of dualism in which the deterministic component is far more ambiguous. In 4Q544 frg. 1:12, Amram is asked by which of the two angels he prefers to be ruled. (14) In frg. 2, it is clear that he places himself under the governance of the angel who

(13) Cf. *Dan* 2:1–3; 4QEn^a (4Q206) 4 ii 1; 4QEnGiants^b (4Q530) 2ii+6–12, 6, 16, 23; *IQapGen* (IQ20) XIX:14. For a recent study of dream visions in *IQapGen*, see E. Eshel, "The Dream Visions in the Noah's Story of the Genesis Apocryphon and Related Texts," *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceeding of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006* (STJD 80; ed. A.K. Petersen et. al.; Leiden: Brill 2009), 41–62.

(14) Kister points to a similarity in this connection with the story related by Xenophon concerning Hercules, who must choose between following virtue or vice (*Memorabilia* 2.21–33). Xenophon presents the good and evil paths by personifying them as two women: see Kister, "On Good and Evil," 521.

opposes “Malchiresha,” although the way in which the Angel of Light assumes this status in Amram’s life remains obscure. While frg. 1 suggests that is a consequence of *Amram’s personal decision*, frg. 2 appears to carry no such element of free choice.

Strikingly, the description of Amram’s encounter with the angels in the *Visions of Amram* offers no moral guidelines regarding good or evil. While it is clear that the figure of Malchiresha controls a group of people, no indication is given as to the nature of their sins or transgressions. Being neither polemic nor apologetic in nature, the description differs from the dualistic descriptions of the sectarian literature, which are full of vehement invective against the wicked and fulsome praise of the righteous.

The *Visions of Amram* also employs the designations “Sons of Light” (בני נהורא) and “Sons of Darkness” (בני חשוכא) which form part of the terminology prevalent in the sectarian literature. Although these epithets occur solely in 4Q548, a manuscript generally considered to constitute a copy of the *Visions of Amram*, scholars have tended to view their presence as indicative of the fact that a dualism similar to that of the Qumran sectarian literature also exists in the *Visions of Amram*. A closer examination of the text, however, reveals that 4Q548 possesses distinctive features not shared by other copies of the *Visions of Amram*. (15) Its content does not overlap with any of the five copies of the *Visions of Amram*; it does not mention Amram’s name; and it is written in a different literary fashion which takes the form of sapiential instructions given in the second person plural (אתם) – a style not found in the *Visions of Amram*. Since the question of the relationship between manuscript 4Q548 and the *Visions of Amram* requires further investigation and the literary association between the two texts is dubious, in my opinion, (16) an integral link between the terms “Sons of light” and “Sons of darkness” and the *Visions of Amram* must be questioned.

The fragmentary text indicates that the name “Malchiresha” is one of three names by which this dark figure is known. (17) Since the

(15) A recently published article on the *Visions of Amram* does not regard this manuscript as one of the copies of the former composition, although it provides no indication of the reason why its author adopts this view: see R. Duke, “Moses’ Hebrew name: The Evidence of the Visions of Amram,” *DSD* 14 (2007): 34–48.

(16) A link may well exist, however, between 4Q548 and another Aramaic work from Qumran, the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542). These two texts share a common literary style and terminology, leading to the possibility that 4Q548 may in fact constitute another Qumran copy of the *Testament of Qahat*. I hope to discuss this issue at greater depth in a separate article.

(17) This understanding is inferred from two pieces of evidence. Firstly, a *waw* (“and”) followed by the name Malchiresha appears in frg. 2, line 13. The fact that a space is missing preceding this *waw* allows speculation regarding other names given to this dark spirit. Secondly, in frg. 3 the angel refers to “three names” (תלתא שמות) with respect to the dark spirit.

two other names have not been preserved, however, they remain unknown. The designation “Malchiresha” employed as an epithet for an evil spirit occurs in the sectarian text entitled “4QCurses” (4Q280). (18) The maledictions addressed to Malchiresha in this text also resemble those in *IQS* II:5–10, where they are directed against “all the men of the lot of Belial.”

The similarity between 4QCurses and *IQS* II led Milik to propose that Malchiresha was also known as “Belial” and the “Prince of Darkness” (שר השוכא). (19) The use of the epithets “Belial” and “Prince of Darkness” in the *Visions of Amram*—which ostensibly corroborates the claim that the dualism expressed in this text is closely linked to that of the sectarian compositions—creates a misleading impression of affinity and resemblance in this regard, however. (20) Milik’s suggestion will be discussed in further detail below.

One of Malchiresha’s prominent features is his intimidating appearance. His description as dark-faced and attired in colorful dress is intended to convey his serpent-like qualities (4Q544 frg. 1:13); his counterpart, in distinction, is depicted as possessing a jovial countenance (4Q544 frg. 1:14). While the description of the latter’s dress is unfortunately absent, the missing passage may describe his apparel of light. Since the scene in which the two figures appears occurs when Amram is faced with the choice of deciding by whom he wishes to be ruled, Malchiresha’s fearsome appearance should perhaps be read as a warning sign. The disparity between the inviting appearance of the light-infused angel and Malchiresha’s alarming form aids Amram in making what is evidently considered to constitute the correct decision, namely, choosing the Angel of Light as his ruler.

The contrastive imagery of light and darkness offers insight into the nature of dualism employed in this composition. While the nature of the two figures as represented by their respective appearances influences Amram’s fate, it does not determine it. His future is not predestined but is dependent upon his free will and personal choice. Furthermore, Amram makes his decision following a free exchange with the fair-complexioned angel, who draws him through his pleasant appearance to join the “righteous” and walk according to the “right” way.

Malchiresha’s multicolored clothing is also noteworthy in light of the rabbinic warning against being seduced by the vivid garb associated with the angel Azazel, who, according to some sources, was

(18) Nitzan, “4QCurses.”

(19) Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et un citation d’Origène,” 85–86.

(20) Contra Davidson, who accepts these names and views the dualism in the *Visions of Amram* as being identical to that in the sectarian compositions: M.J. Davidson, *Angels at Qumran: A Comparative Study of 1 Enoch 1–36, 72–108 and Sectarian Writings from Qumran* (JSPSupp 11; Sheffield: Academic Press, 1992), 266–67.

one of the angels who had intercourse with the “daughters of men” (*Gen* 6:2–4). The fact that some rabbinic midrashim interpret the injunction in *Deuteronomy* 23:10 to “be on your guard against anything untoward” as a prohibition against male observation of beautiful and/or married women or their fancy attire (21) and that Azazel appears to have been attired in colorful clothing when he sinned against the daughters of men, suggests that Malchiresha’s similar apparel may signify his serpent-like, dark qualities. (22)

Similarities also exist between Malchiresha and the figure of Death in the long recension of the Greek version of the *Testament of Abraham*, generally considered to be a Jewish apocryphal composition from the first century C.E. (23) In 17:12–16, Death demonstrates to Abraham the way in which he presents himself to sinners:

Then Death put off all his beauty and loveliness and all his glory and his sun-like form that he has worn. And he put on a robe of tyranny, and he made his face gloomy, more fierce than all wild beasts and more unclean than all uncleanness. And he showed to Abraham seven fiery dragons’ heads and fourteen faces – the faces of a blazing fire and great fierceness, and the face of a horrible precipice, and the face of a murky darkness, and the face of a most gloomy viper, and a face more fierce than an asp, and the face of a beautiful lion, and the face of a fearful lion, and the face of a horned serpent and basilisk. (24)

Of Death’s fourteen intimidating faces, three – the asp, serpent, and basilisk – belong to the snake family, recalling Malchiresha’s serpent-like qualities. In addition to their similar descriptions, the two compositions also contain an intimate conversation between a human being and a spirit-like figure whose purpose is to convey to the former a clear understanding of the Spirit’s character.

The physical similarity between Malchiresha and Death raises the question of a possible link between Malchiresha and Death in the *Visions of Amram*. May the angels’ joint response, “We rule over all people” (*frg.* 1:12), not be intended to assert that, “We rule over all people, dead and alive”? Since the limits of Malchiresha’s domain are not given, it is possible that it includes the dead – those not on earth. Thus, for example, when the speaking angel determines the

(21) *Midrash Tannaim to Deut* 23:10; *Yalqut Shimoni, Deuteronomy*, Ki Tetzai 23.

(22) For a discussion of these texts, see Milik, “4QVisions de ‘Amram et un citation d’Origène,” 82.

(23) For a recent, comprehensive treatment of the *Testament of Abraham*, including an Introduction, versions of the long and short texts, and an English translation and commentary, see D.C. Allison, *Testament of Abraham* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; ed. L. Stuckenbruck, Berlin/NY: Walter de Gruyter, 2003).

(24) For the English translation, see Allison, *Testament of Abraham*, 334.

borders of his authority, he states: "I rule over all lightness from the sky to the earth" (frg. 2:16).

The analysis presented above indicates the existence of clear parallels between the *Visions of Amram* and the *Testament of Abraham*. These are evident in the similar description of Malchiresha and Death as fear-inspiring, serpent-like figures and in the parallels reflected in the conversation between the main protagonist and the angel(s). At the same time, such characteristics as the detailed description of the physical appearance of the angels and close contact with spirits are absent both from the sectarian writings from Qumran and the non-sectarian texts discovered there. In this respect, the *Visions of Amram* appears to diverge from the demonology and angelology characteristic of the Qumran literature.

A distinctive contrast between the *Visions of Amram* and the *Testament of Abraham* can also be found in the description of Amram's conversation with the angels and Abraham's meeting with Death in the respective texts. While Abraham's encounter with Death occurs just prior to his own demise, Amram received his vision when he was in Canaan to bury his fathers, before he returned to Egypt. This is clear from 4Q547 frg. 9:8–9: וְאֵנָּה אֲתַעִירָת מִן שְׁנַת עֵינֵי וְחִזּוּא [וְאֵנָּה אֲתַעִירָת מִן שְׁנַת עֵינֵי וְחִזּוּא] כְּתָבָא בְּכַתָּב / בְּלֹחָא מִן קֹדֶם נִחַתְתָּא מִן אֲרַעְכּוֹנָא וְהוּא לִי כְּדִי אִמְ לִי מְלֹאכָא. (25)

This divergence raises the question of the purpose for which the vision was revealed to Amram, as well as the link between the various sections of the book, particularly that between the visions and the description of Amram's journey to Canaan to bury his fathers.

The establishment of a common identity between Malchiresha and Death helps us better understand the structure of the composition. The three sections into which it is divided all deal, directly or indirectly, with issues associated with death. Amram's delivery of his testament to his sons is directly occasioned by his imminent decease, while in the second passage death comprises the reason why Amram journeys to Canaan (to bury his fathers). The third scene, in which Amram encounters the two angels, appears to constitute the first vision he receives – or at least the first which he recounts to his sons on his deathbed. According to the interpretation proposed above, Amram is herein faced with the choice of deciding whether to obey Malchiresha or his counterpart – i.e., the Angel of Darkness or the Angel of Light, the forces of evil or those of good, Death or Life. (26)

(25) In contrast to Kobelski, who maintains that Amram received the dream-vision just before his death, and Milik, who interprets the ensuing struggle between the two angels as relating to the question of who will take possession of Amram upon his demise: Milik, "4QVisions de 'Amram et un citation d'Origène," 85; Kobelski, *Melchizedek and Melchiresa*, 29.

(26) 4Q544 frg. 1:12: וְאִמְרִי לִי בְּמִן מִנְּנָא אֲנִתָּהּ בַּעַה לְאַשְׁתַּלְטָהּ.

The continuation makes it clear that Amram chooses Life, since the addressing angel – who stands in opposition to Malchiresha – states that it is he who rules over Amram. (27) Amram bequeaths his choice of Life to his sons, the text here possibly being modeled on the biblical command: “Choose life—if you and your offspring would live” (*Deut* 30:19). The biblical text itself associates life with the “good” and the “blessing,” death being “evil” and a “curse”: “See, I put before you this day life and prosperity, death and adversity” (*Deut* 30:15) (cf. also *ibid*, 19b). (28)

The command to “choose life” forms part of the blessings and curses attached to the covenant God commanded Moses to conclude between Himself and the Israelites in Moab, to which the people stood witness (*Deut* 28:69–30:20). (29) The purpose of the blessings and curses was to convince the people to observe the covenant: obedience to the laws assured their life. It is thus possible that in the *Visions of Amram*, the decision to choose Life which Amram commands his sons – Moses and Aaron – in his final testament, carries a similar existential significance for the Israelites. Specifically, Moses is the person who will deliver Israel from bondage and slavery in Egypt and lead them through the wilderness until they enter the Land. (30)

If a link between Amram’s testament and his vision of the two angels can be established, what is the relationship between the description of his journey to bury his fathers in Canaan and the delivery of his testimony and his meeting with the angels? (31) One possible explanation may lie in the fact that Amram communicates his visions to his sons chronologically. Thus, according to 4Q547 frg. 9:8–9, he awakes from the vision while in Canaan (see above). In other words, the journey to bury his fathers in Canaan takes place *prior* to the visions, Amram relating the events of his life to his sons as they occurred. This explanation is inadequate, however, since the events recounted in the testament appear to constitute prophecies or religious/moral instructions to Moses and Aaron. (32) We thus wish to propose that the story of the burial of Amram’s fathers and his en-

(27) 4Q544 frg. 2:11: [מ]שֹׁלֵט עַל־יָד.

(28) In the biblical context, these terms are associated more intimately with prosperity and health versus poverty, sickness, and lack of honor than with “good and evil”: see J.H. Tigay, *Deuteronomy (JPS Torah Commentary)*; Philadelphia/Jerusalem: JPS, 1996), 287.

(29) For this division of Deuteronomy, see A. Rofé, *Introduction to Deuteronomy* (Jerusalem: Academon, 1988, 179–80 (Hebrew).

(30) I hope to publish separately a detailed examination of the fragments in the *Visions of Amram* which relate to Israel’s deliverance from Egypt.

(31) The section dealing with the burial constitutes the second literary unit (see above).

(32) Dimant, “The Testament as a Literary Form in Early Jewish Pseudepigraphic Literature,” 81.

counter with the angels convey a common theme, which Amram represents to his sons in his testament. An understanding of this link consequently constitutes the key to Amram's testament as a whole. We shall now proceed to examine the relationship between these two paragraphs in depth, including their literary-biblical association(s).

The section describing the burial of Amram's fathers evidently holds a central place in the worldview of the author and the circles to which he belonged. (33) The biblical account speaks only of Jacob's burial in Canaan (*Gen* 50:7–14) and the carrying up of Joseph's bones from Egypt for burial in Shechem (*Josh* 24:32). No mention is made of the burial of any of Joseph's brothers who died in Egypt (*Exod* 1:6). In the *Visions of Amram*, however, special attention is paid to this subject (around 14 lines (34)), apparently due to the link with Levi and his brothers. (35) The depiction itself emphasizes the importance of the act of burial, which, in order to be performed during the war between Egypt and Philistia, compelled Amram to remain alone in Hebron for forty-one years, separated from his father and wife (4Q544 frg. 1:4–7).

In light of this fact, the placement of the unit dealing with the burial between that of the delivery of the testament and the vision of the angels appears to reflect an attempt to preserve a chronological continuity. At the same time, however, a conceptual association linking the three paragraphs should also be sought in order to explain the significance attributed to the burial of the fathers in Canaan.

I would like to propose that the conceptual and religious background to this unit, which connects the three paragraphs in the *Visions of Amram*, may lie in *Jeremiah* 8:1–3: “At that time—declares the LORD—the bones of the kings of Judah, of its officers, of the priests, of the prophets, and of the inhabitants of Jerusalem shall be taken out of their graves ... They shall not be gathered for reburial; they shall become dung upon the face of the earth. And death shall be preferable to life for all that are left of this wicked folk ...”

(33) The motif of Amram's burial of his fathers in Canaan has not received the detailed scholarly attention it deserves. For this section in *Jubilees* 46, however, see Halpern-Amaru, “Burying the Fathers.”; J. Van Ruiten, “Between Jacob's Death and Moses' Birth: The Intertextual Relationship between Genesis 50:15–Exodus 1:14 and Jubilees 46:1–16,” in *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honor of Florentino García Martínez* (Supplement to JSJ 122; ed. A. Hilhorst, É. Puech, and E. Tigchelaar; Leiden: Brill, 2007), 467–89; Werman, “The Aramaic Sources of the Book of Jubilees.”

(34) See the overlap between 4Q544 1:1–9 and 4Q545 1a–b col. ii: 11–19.

(35) The patriarchs are not identified by name but merely through the generic noun (“our fathers” – אֲבוֹתֵינוּ) (cf. 4Q545 1a–b ii 12). The fact that the text is speaking of the generation of Levi, Amram's grandfather, rather than his father's generation, is made clear in 4Q546 frg. 2:3, wherein Qahat urges Amram to remain in Hebron during the Egyptian-Philistine war so that he can bury his fathers.

In this passage, the prophet accuses the residents of Judah of engaging in sun-and star-worship involving the desecration of the dead. In Jeremiah's eyes, (36) such behavior constitutes a choice of "death" over "life" and thus, in effect, a disavowal of the covenant with the "God of life." (37) He construes the command to "choose life" in *Deuteronomy* 30 to mean that desecration of the dead through the failure to bury their bones constitutes a "choosing of death." In my opinion, it is possible that the author of the *Visions of Amram* understood that the command to "choose life" similarly demanded the burial of the patriarchs in their family inheritance – as opposed to interment in Egypt. Amram thus "chooses Life" by ensuring that the remainder of Joseph's brothers are brought up from Egypt and are buried in the Cave of the Machpelah together with their fathers.

In the following vision, Amram once again "chooses Life," this time by electing to be ruled by the Angel who governs the domain of Light. In his testament, he bequeaths these decisions to "choose Life" to his two sons, Moses and Aaron. His dying wish is that they will continue his "way" and "choose Life" for themselves – and for the nation of Israel as a whole – by means of their future deeds. Their task is to deliver Israel from Egypt and to bring the people to Mount Sinai to make a covenant with God. (38)

This examination of the details given in the *Visions of Amram* demonstrates the presence of a dualism divergent from the dualistic ideology reflected in both the sectarian and the other Aramaic non-sectarian texts from Qumran. The principal difference between the two sets of texts lies in the fact that the *Visions of Amram* contains no traces of moral judgment in its treatment of the forces of darkness, Malchiresha, and those who fall under Malchiresha's rule. (39) It likewise omits any mention of the type of moral instructions found in the *Testament of Qahat* (4Q542) and 4Q548, (40) replacing these with an intimate and friendly human-angelic exchange. In contrast to the sectarian belief in predestination, the *Visions of Amram* holds to the possibility of free choice. The data thus suggests that the dualism

(36) See W.L. Holladay, *Jeremiah 1* (Hermeneia; Philadelphia: Fortress, 1986), 271–72.

(37) Ibid, including the suggestion that this passage constitutes a later, post-exilic gloss.

(38) This theme is described in 4Q546 frgs. 8:3, 9:5–6, and 10: 1–3. See also n. 30 above.

(39) The sole critique of Malchiresha in these texts is related to his name.

(40) For this reason, Milik's suggestion, followed by Kobelski, that Malchiresha's other two names should be identified as the "Prince of Darkness" and "Belial" is to be rejected, in my opinion, since they both occur in the sectarian texts in relation to angelic figures belonging to the forces of darkness/evil in line with the sectarian dualist ideology – elements which are completely absent from the *Visions of Amram*. See above, n. 19.

prevalent in this composition relates to life and death rather than to righteousness and sinfulness, and that its purpose lies in emphasizing the necessity of “choosing Life” on a personal, familial, and national level.

Liora GOLDMAN

L'ÉPIGRAPHIE DE QUMRÂN:

Son apport à l'identification du site

TRAITER l'épigraphie de Qumrân en quelques pages est une gageure, et il serait bien téméraire de ma part de prétendre réussir ce tour de force. Je vais me limiter à quelques aspects pris dans plusieurs directions touchant à des sujets discutés: 1) la place des inscriptions dans la relation des ruines et des grottes et, en corollaire, l'identification des occupants, 2) les groupements des livres normatifs à Qumrân, et 3) des exemples montrant l'intérêt de cette découverte pour l'histoire des Religions et le judaïsme ancien en particulier (1).

Tout d'abord quelques précisions sont nécessaires. Par 'épigraphie', j'englobe aussi bien la paléographie au sens où l'entendent les humanistes, hellénistes et latinistes, l'étude des papyri et des manuscrits, que l'épigraphie à proprement parler, qui est pour tous l'étude des inscriptions sur divers supports durs, comme la pierre, la céramique, le métal, et le bois en particulier. Et je réserve la dénomination 'paléographie' à la science particulière de l'étude du tracé des lettres et de leur évolution, étude indispensable pour l'attribution d'une écriture à une même main ou à différentes mains, pour l'attribution à une langue ou dialecte particulier dans un territoire donné, et pour la datation de la copie ou de la gravure d'un texte.

Qumrân, qui a désigné d'abord les grottes puis la *Khirbeh*, et 'Ain Feshkha ont livré une très riche documentation épigraphique dans le sens défini ici, la plus importante sans doute du XX^e siècle dans le Proche Orient ancien. Ont été retrouvés dans les grottes quelque 730 manuscrits hébreux et de très nombreux fragments non en-

(1) Cette note constituait la première partie d'une conférence donnée à l'École Biblique et Archéologique Française de Jérusalem lors de la *Journée Qumrân à la mémoire de John Strugnell*, mardi 31 mars 2009. Les deux autres parties paraîtront sous les titres «La constitution de groupements de livres normatifs à Qumrân» et «Quelques exemples d'apports des manuscrits à l'étude du judaïsme ancien», à paraître dans la *Revue Biblique*. Cette note en a gardé le style oral accompagnée de notes.

core identifiés, des restes de 122 manuscrits araméens et 64 fragments non identifiés (soit plus de 15% de l'ensemble), des restes d'une vingtaine de papyri et de manuscrits grecs, et des restes d'au moins 5 ou 6 manuscrits en alphabet cryptique, soit environ au minimum des restes de quelque 900 manuscrits, sans compter d'autres documents divers et comptes en hébreu et en araméen, des exercices de scribes, le tout réparti sur environ trois siècles. Mais Qumrân, la *Khirbeh* et les grottes, et 'Ain Feshkha ont livré aussi des inscriptions diverses en petite quantité datées de cette même époque, sans prendre en considération ici les autres découvertes épigraphiques du désert de Juda, de Massada, du *wadî Khabrah* et environs, des grottes de Murabba'ât, de *Khirbet Mird*, et celles de documents plus anciens du *wadî Daliyeh* (2) et des environs de Jéricho. De ces découvertes du XX^e siècle, il faut rapprocher la découverte de manuscrits du début du III^e siècle (vers 209-11 sous Caracalla) que connut Origène, et celles de la fin du VIII^e siècle que les Qaraïtes ont connus et recopiés et dont on a retrouvé des copies du Moyen Âge dans la *genizah* de la synagogue Al-Fustat du Vieux Caire à la fin du XIX^e siècle. Entre les manuscrits retrouvés, le plus souvent en lambeaux, ceux des précédentes découvertes et ceux qui ont définitivement disparus, on a du mal à mesurer la quantité et la richesse de la bibliothèque qui fut déposée dans les grottes de Qumrân (3).

1 – Les inscriptions retrouvées lors des fouilles officielles

Plusieurs inscriptions ont été découvertes lors des fouilles des grottes et de la *Khirbeh* par l'équipe de R. de Vaux. Parmi elles il faut signaler d'abord des témoignages de l'époque de la monarchie judéenne: une estampille *lmlk* du type disque solaire ailé datant de la fin du VIII^e siècle, et un fragment d'ostracon de la même époque et dans une orthographe judéenne typique (4). Des inscriptions sur

(2) Sur ces derniers documents, voir maintenant Jan Dušek, *Les manuscrits araméens du Wadi Daliyeh et la Samarie vers 450-332 av. J.-C.* (Culture and History of the Ancient Near East 30; Leiden – Boston, 2007).

(3) Il est bien évident que tous les manuscrits retrouvés n'ont pas été copiés ou composés à Qumrân. Les copies antérieures à 150 av. J.-C. viennent d'ailleurs, très probablement du Temple de Jérusalem, ainsi que les manuscrits 'bibliques et apocryphes', en araméen en particulier, qui ont été recopiés par la suite pour les besoins de la communauté et pour la conservation et la transmission des compositions comme il est explicitement demandé au clan sacerdotal dans les *Testaments de Lévi*, de *Qahat* et d'*Amram*, voir en particulier 4Q542 1 ii 9-13, voir aussi 1 *Hénoch* 81,1-6; 82,1-2; 104,12-13, *Jubilés* 45,16, etc. Mais des copies d'un scribe de Qumrân ont été retrouvées à Masada, comme l'a montré A. Yardeni.

(4) Depuis lors, les fouilles de Lakish ont permis de mieux cerner maintenant la datation des divers types d'estampilles *lmlk*, tous datés de la fin du VIII^e siècle, sous Ézéchias, ce qui demande de restreindre quelque peu la datation proposée par R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls* (The Schweich Lectures of the British Academy 1959, London ²1973), p. 2-3. De cette estampille n'est conservée que la moitié supérieure, mais sans inscription en dessous, estampille du type H11b de

jarres, sur des tessons et du plâtre, à l'encre ou au charbon, des incisions en hébreu, en araméen, en grec et en latin, une inscription sur pierre en araméen, des exercices de scribes, deux sceaux, un en sémitique et un en grec, des époques hellénistique et romaine ancienne, provenant de la *Khirbeh* et des grottes environnantes (grottes 3, 4, 6, 7 et 10), et des incisions en hébreu et en grec et une estampille en latin à 'Ain Feshkha, mentionnent le plus souvent des anthroponymes (pour Éléazar, voir *infra*) ou le contenu des récipients (5). Il est intéressant de noter que dans la grotte 7 qui n'a fourni que des textes en grec, a été retrouvée une jarre avec une inscription en sémitique répétée deux fois, portant un anthroponyme araméen probable, *rwm*', en écriture hasmonéenne tardive ou hérodiennienne ancienne (6). La grotte 6 a fourni une jarre avec une inscription en sémitique et une autre jarre avec une inscription en grec.

2 – Ostraca retrouvés dans des sondages postérieurs

Deux ostraca en hébreu furent découverts par chance lors de sondages à l'est du mur de la terrasse marneuse par l'expédition de Strange pendant l'hiver 1996, lors de travaux de remblaiements, mais

Lemaire, (voir A. Lemaire, "Classification des estampilles royales judéennes", *ErIs* 15 (1981) 54*-60*, Pl. VIII). Les deux documents, estampille et ostrakon, sont certainement de la même époque et ne peuvent dater de la fin du VII^e siècle comme il est encore repris ci et là. Sur le disque solaire ailé, voir dernièrement S. Lauber, «Zur Ikonographie der Flügelsonne», *ZDPV* 124 (2008) 89-106.

(5) La publication de ces documents, qui m'était d'abord confiée par le conseil de Faculté en 1987, par A. Lemaire, «Les inscriptions du Khirbeh, des grottes et de 'Ain Feshkha», *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha*, II — *Études d'anthropologie, de physique et de chimie*, présentées par J.-B. Humbert et J. Gunneweg (NTOA SA 3; Fribourg – Göttingen, 2003), 341-88, doit être passablement révisée. Ainsi par exemple, la jarre avec des incisions attribuée à la grotte 8, *8Q10*, vient de la grotte 3 à manuscrits (= grotte 8 de l'exploration), voir R. de Vaux, *DJD* III, p. 7-8, fouillée entre les 14 et 25.03.1952. Aussi surprenant que cela paraisse, on y apprend que des inscriptions ont pu être réalisées à Qumrân dans le locus 110 (qui est la citerne ronde très profonde!) p. 382b, et des lectures proposées sont plus que difficiles, etc. À cette liste, il faut ajouter le couvercle inscrit, voir E. Puech, «Couvercle de jarre inscrit», *Estudios Bíblicos* 40 (1982) 347-52, et d'autres inscriptions sur jarres de Qumrân non prises en considération par Lemaire, voir E. Puech, «Courtes inscriptions de la région de Qumrân», *RevQ* 44 (1984) 525-35. A été aussi retrouvée une inscription de l'époque byzantine, voir Lemaire, *cit.*, p. 380.

(6) Les documents en grec ne peuvent être identifiés avec des écrits du Nouveau Testament, ainsi qu'il a été proposé par certains, et en voulant y trouver une confirmation par leur provenance de Rome (inscription à l'encre noire), voir E. Puech, «Sept fragments grecs de la *Lettre d'Hénoch* (1 Hén 100, 103 et 105) dans la grotte 7 de Qumrân (= 7QHéng^r)», *RevQ* 70 (1997) 313-23. L'empreinte de deux lettres en grec sous de la boue est illisible sur la photographie de 7Q7 (gr), Lemaire, «Les inscriptions...», *cit.*, p. 376. Il est pour le moins surprenant de constater que ce sigle reprend celui qui désigne déjà un fragment de manuscrit grec de la grotte 7, voir M. Baillet, *Les 'petites grottes' de Qumrân*, par M. Baillet, J.T. Milik, et R. de Vaux, (*DJD* III; Oxford, 1962). Cela sera source d'une confusion certaine par la suite. Ce nom est aussi connu en nabatéen.

sans indication précise (semble-t-il, à la base du mur ?) ni stratigraphie (7). L'un d'eux est particulièrement important parce qu'il assure, même sans la lecture *yhd* de l'édition, le caractère essénien de l'occupation de Qumrân-Sokoka, en faisant connaître sur le vif la pratique de la mise en commun des biens par un néophyte ayant accompli ses deux années de probation et de formation (8). Un certain Honî – Onias a vendu sa propriété de Jéricho, maison, installation, champs, arbres et récoltes, à Éléazar, son serviteur, et a apporté le prix de la vente à son intendant. On devrait avoir affaire à une note ou memorandum de transfert de propriété pour l'archivage ensuite dans les registres de la communauté. Cet ostracon n'est pas un acte juridique en bonne et due forme, un contrat de vente, car il ne porte pas la précision du jour, du mois et de l'année, ni de signatures, et il a été rédigé à la troisième personne, et non par le vendeur à la première personne comme il se devrait dans un acte de vente. Il ne peut donc être le brouillon de l'acte officiel de vente rédigé à Jéricho, ainsi que les éditeurs l'ont envisagé. La datation paléographique la plus vraisemblable le situe dans la période hasmonéenne tardive ou hérodiennienne ancienne, ce qui correspond aux tracés d'inscriptions de la Période Ib par leur découverte (9).

Un dénommé Éléazar est déjà connu à Qumrân par une inscription gravée avant cuisson sur la paroi externe d'un bol (KhQ 1650) retrouvé dans le grand dépôt du locus 89. Les tracés de la gravure sont du même type et en tout point comparables à ceux de l'ostracon, KhQ1996/1 (10). Sans doute, l'anthroponyme Éléazar est relative-

(7) Voir E. Puech, «L'ostracon de Khirbet Qumrân (KhQ1996/1) et une vente de terrain à Jéricho, témoin de l'occupation essénienne à Qumrân», *Flores Florentino. Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. by A. Hilhorst, E. Puech and E. Tigchelaar (JSJSup 122; Leiden, 2007), 1-29, avec la bibliographie. Il pourrait tout aussi bien provenir des carres de fouille à l'ouest du mur puisque le fouilleur en déversait les déblais à l'est du mur, les ostraca n'ayant été repérés que lors du remblaiement en fin de campagne. Autrement dit, leur lieu de trouvaille est des plus flous, provenant peut-être même en dehors de la zone explorée, d'autant que les différents rapports du fouilleur sont contradictoires, comme je l'ai signalé dans ma note de 2007. Seule son origine qumranienne est assurée.

(8) C'est, à mon sens, la meilleure explication de la datation donnée à la ligne 1, d'autant que l'analyse paléographique situe l'ostracon à la fin de la Période Ib de préférence à la Période II, malgré les éditeurs qui se sont fondés sur leur déchiffrement du texte pour «la deuxième année» de la révolte juive et non sur une analyse paléographique stricte.

(9) Les éditeurs, Cross et Eshel, l'ont daté de l'an 67 AD guidés par leur compréhension de la ligne 1. Mais A. Yardeni, «A Draft of a Deed on an Ostracon from Khirbet Qumran», *IEJ* 47 (1997) 233-37, qui refuse avec raison la lecture *yhd*, en fait aussi une écriture semi-cursive hérodiennienne ancienne ou hasmonéenne tardive (période Ib de R. de Vaux).

(10) KhQ 1650 a été trouvé lors de la fouille du niveau inférieur dans ce locus entre le 22 et le 30 mars 1954 (notes de R. de Vaux dans *Fouilles de Khirbet Qumrân et de Ain Feshkha* [Fribourg-Göttingen, 1994], p. 320), et non le 08/04/1954, comme

ment fréquent à cette époque et dans la région de Jéricho en particulier d'après les données épigraphiques. Mais si l'analyse pétrochimique pouvait conclure sans conteste à une origine jérichontine de ce bol inscrit, pourrait alors se poser la question de l'identité possible de cet Éléazar avec celui de l'ostrakon, tous les deux de la fin de la Période Ib et originaires de Jéricho (11). Mais on n'a aucun moyen de le vérifier.

Quoi qu'il en soit, à lui seul, cet ostrakon remettrait les pendules à l'heure devant la pléthore d'hypothèses contradictoires proposées depuis une vingtaine d'années, hypothèses qui se réfutent les unes les autres. Il demande de revenir à l'identification avancée par le fouilleur qui a mis en relation étroite les manuscrits des grottes et l'occupation du site aux Périodes Ib et II.

3 – Inscriptions trouvées lors de fouilles en territoire occupé

Une dizaine d'autres inscriptions, ostraca en hébreu, en araméen et en grec, ont été découvertes au cours de fouilles menées entre 1993 et 2004 dans des décharges à l'est du mur de la terrasse et au nord du site. Un seul ostrakon en hébreu a été à présent publié; il porte un anthroponyme avec son origine: 'l'zr bn yšw' hbyrwy = «Éléazar, fils de Yeshua' le Beyrôtin», localité connue en 1 Ch 11,39 *habbéroty* = 2 S 4,2 ss, *hb'rti*, «de Bérôt» en Benjamin (12). La datation

l'écrit Lemaire, «Les inscriptions...», *cit.*, p. 356, qui précise même «Le bol appartient à l'important dépôt du locus 89 à la Période II», contrairement à l'opinion du fouilleur, premier témoin du terrain, pour suivre celle de J.T. Milik, *Ten years of discovery in the wilderness of Judaea* (London, 1959), p. 55, en écrivant «Comme le suggère déjà J.T. Milik, on peut rattacher approximativement la graphie assez soignée du bol au 1^{er} s. de notre ère», et celle de J.-B. Humbert! Or R. de Vaux, *Archaeology and the Dead Sea Scrolls*, *op. cit.*, p. 11-12 et note 1, se prononce clairement pour la Période Ib d'après les données archéologiques (stratigraphiques et céramologiques), mettant sérieusement en doute les conclusions de Milik dans l'interprétation de ces données, ainsi que la valeur intrinsèque des arguments paléographiques, avec raison à mon sens, comme il apparaît maintenant. F.M. Cross lui-même suit maintenant l'opinion de R. de Vaux pour une datation paléographique à la fin de la Période Ib (voir «The Development of the Jewish Scripts», *The Bible and the Ancient Near East. Essays in Honor of W.F. Albright*, ed. by G.E. Wright [New York, 1961], 133-202, p. 190, note 9). À ce sujet, voir les indications bibliographiques et mes réserves sur cette datation tardive, pour retenir comme solides les conclusions de R. de Vaux, (Puech, «L'ostrakon de *Khirbet Qumrân*», *cit.*, p. 21 et note 49). Toutefois, rien n'indique qu'un même scribe ait inscrit le bol et l'ostrakon, et ce n'est pas nécessaire pour une datation contemporaine.

(11) Pour cela il faudrait qu'Éléazar soit un potier de Qumrân ou qu'un potier ait voulu graver tout spécialement son nom, ou qu'Éléazar ait emporté son bol en venant à Sokoka-Qumrân, ce qui pourrait mieux expliquer pourquoi il est le seul de cet important groupe de bols à porter une inscription.

(12) Voir Y. Magen and Y. Peleg, «Back to Qumrân: Ten Years of Excavation and Research, 1993-2004», dans *Qumran. The Site of the Dead Sea Scrolls: Archaeological Interpretations and Debates*, ed. by K. Galor, J.-B. Humbert, and J. Zangenberg (Leiden, 2006), 55-103, p. 60, 64, 71, 72-73, mais cet ostrakon est une inscription en hébreu, en lisant *bn* et *hbyrwy*, non *br* et *hbwyrt* avec les éditeurs. On doit encore

paléographique rejoint celle des deux ostraca trouvés par l'expédition Strange de l'hiver 1996. Une autre estampille *lmlk* a été découverte à l'est du mur de la terrasse, elle est elle aussi du type disque solaire ailé mais elle porte l'inscription *lmlk ḥbrn* (13).

Ces maigres inscriptions font connaître le lieu d'origine de deux hommes, Éléazar de Bérôt en Benjamin et Honî de Jéricho en Éphraïm (14), et sur l'ostracon KhQ 1996/2 la lecture *m'y[n]* peut être diversement complétée, «de 'Ai[n Gedi» tout à fait possible avec les éditeurs, mais aussi d'autres toponymes en Juda ou d'ailleurs.

Notons encore que l'accès aux grottes à manuscrits 7 à 9 ne pouvait se faire qu'en traversant l'espace de la terrasse occupée par les habitants du site, que les grottes 4, 5 et 10 sont contiguës à la *Khirbeh*, et que la grotte 6 se trouve près du tracé du canal (15). Ajoutons enfin que les grottes et le site ont tous deux livré également des écrits en hébreu, en araméen et en grec, y compris un sceau en grec, et que des exercices de scribes, alphabets et autres, ont été retrouvés dans les ruines (16) comme dans les grottes (17). Ces derniers dénotent à eux seuls, à n'en pas douter, un apprentissage de l'écriture en plusieurs langues qui assure lui aussi à sa manière le lien étroit entre les grottes et le site. En effet, on voit mal que des documents de

noter que la plupart des ostraca ont été trouvés dans les décharges au nord, à l'est et à l'ouest (locus 24) du site.

(13) Voir Magen – Peleg, *cit.* p. 76-77, mais ils ne donnent pas la lecture de l'inscription. Leur note 53 n'est pas exacte: la première a été découverte au sud du locus 66. Par ailleurs les auteurs estiment que l'occupation judéenne a duré jusqu'à l'exil (p. 72-79 et 101 s). Les seules données épigraphiques n'autorisent pas une telle conclusion (voir ci-dessus note 4 à propos de l'estampille *lmlk*), il faut attendre la publication de tous les autres indices et de toutes les données de la fouille pour se faire une idée plus assurée, et discuter l'hypothèse assez surprenante faisant de Qumrân une fabrique de poterie.

(14) Mais la lecture Ḥisday de Holon sur l'ostracon KhQ1996/1 des éditeurs, Cross et Eshel, n'est pas à retenir, voir Puech, *Flores Florentino*, *cit.*

(15) Les grottes 1, 2, 3 et 11 n'en sont pas très éloignées au nord. Le *Rouleau de cuivre* de la grotte 3 qui donne entre autres une liste de cachettes de trésors dans la région de Jéricho et Qumrân (= Sokoka) a dû être composé à Qumrân, et non avoir été importé et caché par des non esséniens dans une grotte derrière des jarres provenant de Qumrân, comme j'ai essayé de le montrer ailleurs, *Le Rouleau de cuivre de la Grotte 3 de Qumrân (3Q15). Expertise – Restauration – Épigraphie*, par D. Brizemeure et N. Lacoudre EDF, et E. Puech, Volume I – *Texte*, Volume II – *Planches* (STDJ 55; Leiden, 2006). Tout autre solution est invraisemblable, car le fouilleur, R. de Vaux, a montré que les jarres devaient presque toucher le plafond avant son écroulement, ce qui interdit un dépôt au fond de la grotte après celui des jarres.

(16) Voir KhQ2289. L'ostracon KhQ161 porte en fait un «élémentaire» puisque le scribe a certainement commencé par la ligne '2' avec la séquence *lamed, mem, nun* (= el, em, en = élément) ou deuxième moitié de l'alphabet avec un retour au-dessus de la ligne, ligne '1', et qu'il a fini par la première moitié, '*aleph, bet* (= alphabet ou abécédaire) = lignes '3-4', contrairement à Lemaire, «Les inscriptions du Khirbeh...», *cit.* p. 342. Cette manière d'apprendre à écrire est connue par ailleurs.

(17) Voir 4Q234, 4Q341, 4Q360.

ce genre aient pu être emportés de Jérusalem ou de quelque autre bibliothèque pour être mis à l'abri dans des grottes devant un danger imminent. Si la présence d'encriers (18) et de «tables» (19) assure l'existence d'une salle de scribes ou «scriptorium» à Qumrân (à l'étage du *locus* 30), on n'a pas nécessairement affaire pour autant à une école organisée, à plusieurs niveaux d'enseignement pour adolescents, une *beit midrash* comme certains le prétendent (20).

Le lien déjà évident des grottes et du site serait aussi renforcé par des inscriptions similaires, voir une même finale *wl'pk* «et à retourner», sur trois jarres du site KhQ2553b, 2554 et 2661c et une de la grotte 4 (4Q1).

Le contenu des documents retrouvés dans les grottes va dans le même sens. La découverte de plusieurs copies de la *Règle de la Communauté*, du *Document de Damas*, du *Rouleau des Hymnes*, de la *Règle de la Guerre*, et les *Pesharîm*, etc., ne peuvent convenir qu'au mouvement essénien dont les membres menaient une vie communau-

(18) Deux encriers furent trouvés par de Vaux dans le *locus* 30, un dans le *locus* 31. Steckoll dit en avoir trouvé un autre, un autre est dit provenir du *locus* 129, un autre est dit avoir été trouvé dans le *scriptorium* (collection Schøyen) et deux autres appartiennent à des collections privées, soit huit connus, ce qui en fait une grande concentration pour un si petit site. Pour les références, voir J. Gunneweg and M. Bella, «Neutron Activation Analysis Scrolls Jars and Common Ware», *op. cit.* (NTOA SA 3), 3-53, p. 32.

(19) Voir R. de Vaux, *Archaeology*, *op. cit.*, p. 29-33, où le fouilleur décrit les restes de la longue table dépassant 5 m de long, 40 cm de large et 50 cm de haut, et des restes de deux autres tables plus petites, identifiées avec raison comme tables pour écrire. Lemaire, *art. citati*, note suivante, respectivement p. 199s et 69, dispute cette interprétation et en ferait des tables pour la préparation ou la réparation des manuscrits. Si ce genre de tables a pu servir d'abord au réglage des feuilles, il a surtout servi à la copie du texte; le scribe avait besoin d'une surface assez grande pour poser sa feuille à écrire et pour maintenir ouvert l'autre rouleau pour la lecture du texte à copier, il ne pouvait le faire sur ses genoux, et même une copie sous forme de dictée ne peut guère se passer de ces tables. En revanche, la couture des feuilles ou une réparation n'exigeaient pas une table de telles dimensions. On suivra donc encore une fois la conclusion de R. de Vaux comme la seule qui s'impose, et qu'appuie la présence des encriers parmi les déblais, à l'exclusion d'autres explications proposées et farfelues, telles des tables d'un *coenaculum* — *triclinium* (voir par exemple P. Donceel-Voûte, «'Coenaculum' — la salle à l'étage du *locus* 30 à Khirbet Qumrân sur la mer Morte», *Banquets d'Orient*, Res Orientales IV, sous la direction de R. Gyselen, Groupe pour l'étude de la Civilisation du Moyen Orient, Bures-sur-Yvette, 1992, 61-84), etc., et la réponse de R. Reich, «A Note on the Function of Room 30 (the 'Scriptorium') at Khirbet Qumran», *JJS* 46 (1995) 157-60.

(20) Voir A. Lemaire, «L'enseignement essénien et l'école de Qumrân», *Hellenica et Judaica. Hommage à Valentin Nikiprowetzky*, A. Caquot, M. Hadas-Lebel et J. Riaud eds (Leuven-Paris, 1986), 191-203, p. 197, la salle de cours serait à situer au *locus* 4 (sans ouverture autre que la porte pour tout éclairage!), *idem*, «Lire, écrire, étudier à Qoumrân et ailleurs», *Qoumrân et le judaïsme du tournant de notre ère. Actes de la Table Ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004*, sous la direction d'A. Lemaire et S. Mimouni (Paris-Louvain, 2006), 63-79. Il est peu probable que Qumrân ait servi de 'centre de formation intellectuelle — École' pour tous les 'novices' esséniens.

taire, ce que la disposition des *loci* du site et leurs fonctions appuient largement, ainsi que la topographie du site et l'occupation dans les grottes creusées dans le plateau marneux tout autour (21).

Ce simple rappel des faits confirme, me semble-t-il déjà du seul point de vue épigraphique, l'intuition et l'interprétation défendues par le fouilleur et les membres de son équipe (J.T. Milik, F.M. Cross, etc.), à savoir le lien étroit entre le contenu des grottes et le site de Qumrân d'une part et, d'autre part, l'identification des occupants du site avec les Esséniens déjà connus par d'autres sources externes qui les situent dans cette région (Pline l'Ancien et Dion). Viendrait corroborer cette conclusion, l'*Instrumental Neutron Activation Analysis* de jarres de la *Khirbeh* et des grottes dont le résultat confirmerait le lien étroit entre le site et les grottes (22).

En conclusion, ces quelques réflexions sur les seules inscriptions provenant des grottes et du site confirment à l'évidence le rapport étroit entre ces différents lieux de trouvailles habités par les mêmes occupants, comme l'ont compris le fouilleur et bien d'autres à sa suite, occupants que les pionniers ont identifiés avec raison aux Esséniens des sources externes, les héritiers des «hommes pieux» (Si 44,1). A priori, les données archéologiques connues de l'occupation du site ne s'opposent pas au contenu des manuscrits ni à la documentation épigraphique retrouvée.

Le Professeur J. Strugnell était avec J. T. Milik un des piliers de l'équipe internationale qui œuvra patiemment et avec succès au regroupement des dizaines de milliers de fragments en ensembles manuscrits et à leur déchiffrement, même s'il n'a pu mener à bien la publication de tout son important lot de la grotte 4. Notre dette est grande envers lui pour ses vues pénétrantes dans bien des domaines, bien au-delà de 4QMMT auquel il a été fait allusion dans cette conférence. Ayant eu l'honneur et le privilège de travailler à ses côtés pendant de longues années, j'ai pu apprécier sa grande compétence et ses intuitions dans bien des domaines, ainsi que la générosité avec laquelle il savait partager et communiquer son immense savoir. Je lui suis redevable d'une profonde reconnaissance pour ses encouragements et sa totale confiance dans le déchiffrement et la publication de textes inconnus. En tant que membre de la première de l'équipe internationale d'édition, puis comme éditeur-en-chef, il était bien placé pour en mesurer les difficultés.

Émile PUECH
CNRS — Paris
EBAF — Jérusalem

(21) Voir aussi M. Broshi – H. Eshel, «Residential Caves at Qumran», *DSD* 6/3 (1999) 328-48, grottes au nord du site et reliées par un sentier où furent retrouvés des monnaies, clous, céramiques de la première moitié du 1^{er} siècle.

(22) Voir à ce sujet Jan Gunneweg and M. Balla, «Neutron Activation Analysis Scrolls Jars and Common Ware», *Khirbet Qumrân et 'Ain Feshkha. II, op. cit.*, 3-53, p. 27b et 30a.

QUMRANIC MARRIAGE PROHIBITIONS AND RABBINIC EQUIVALENTS

4 *Q396 MMT* prohibits marriage between priests and Israelite women and *4Q271* relates to other marriage issues. Shemesh suggests that a rabbinic קל וחומר type consideration was the foundation of Qumran's intermarriage prohibition between priests and Israelites, reasoning that since the mating of two pure animals is forbidden, surely the union of priests and Israelites is similarly prohibited. (1) This paper will argue that Qumran is opposed to rabbinic-type exegesis, and that, therefore, the cited biblical prohibition against interbreeding of animals or plants does not provide any meaningful explanation for the prohibition against priests marrying Israelites. I will demonstrate that the rabbinic recommendation against Israelites marrying priestly daughters, which Shemesh compares to the Qumranic prohibition, actually originates from a different motive. In addition, this paper will argue against Shemesh's reading of vv. 271 9-10 לאשר לוא הוכן לה, which he interprets as a ban on marrying off one's daughter to one other than the previously pledged husband. His interpretation, construed on a complex structure, is influenced by rabbinic-type exegesis and is not supported by the cited biblical verse. A meticulous analysis reveals the flaws in his interpretation. This paper will argue for a different reading of the ambiguous biblical verse cited above, that is, as instruction against marrying a woman deemed "unsuitable." In addition, I will postulate an alternate understanding of the two Qumranic rules, founded on the two distinct biblical commands.

(1) A. Shemesh, "Two Principles of the Qumranic Matrimonial Law," *Fifty Years of Dead Sea Scrolls Research* (eds. G. Brin and B. Nitzan, Jerusalem 2001), 1812-203.

The texts in question are the following:

4Q396 (4QMMT^c) IV 4-11 (2)

- 4 ועל הזונות הנעסה בתוך העם והמה ב[ני]
 5 קדש משכתוב קודש ישראל ועל בה[מה טהורה]
 6 כתוב שלוא לרבעה כלאים ועל לבושנים שלוא
 7 יהיה שעטנו ושלוא לזרוע שדו וכ[רמו כלאים]
 8 [ב]גלל שהמה קדושים ובני אהרון ק[דושי קדושים]
 9 [וא]תם יודעים שמקצת הכהנים והנעם מתערבים
 10 [ו]הנעם מתוככים ומטמאים[ם] את זרע[ם] הקודש ואף
 11 את זרע[ם] עם הזונות כן

4 And concerning the fornications carried out in the midst of the people: they are me[mbers of ...] 5 (of) holiness, as it is written: "Holy is Israel". And concerning the [pure] an[imal] 6 it is written that he shall not let two species mate; and concerning clot[hing, that no] 7 materials are to be mixed; and he will not sow his field or [his]vi[neyard with two species] 8 [be]cause they are holy. But the sons of Aaron are the ho[liest of the holy] 9 [and y]ou know that a part of the priests and of the [people mingle] 10 [and] th[ey] unite with each other and defile the [holy] seed [and also] their [own] [seed] with fornications, be[cause ...]

4Q271 (4QD^f) III 7-15 (3)

- ואם
 8 [את בתו יתן איש לאי]ש את כול מומיה יספר לו למה יביא עליו את משפט
 9 [הארור אשר אמר] משנה עור בדרך וגם אל יתנהה לאשר לוא הוכן לה כי
 10 [הוא כלאים ש]ור וחמור ולבוש צמר (ו)פשתים יחדין vac אל יבא איש
 11 [אשה בברית] (?) הקדש אשר ידעה לעשות מעשה מידבר ואשר ידעה
 12 [מעשה בבית] אביה או אלמנה אשר נשכבה מאשר התארמלה וכול
 13 [אשר עליה שם] רע בבתוליה בבית אביה אל יקחה איש כי אם
 14 [בראות נשים] נאמנות וידעות ברורות ממאמר המבקר אשר על
 15 [הרבים ואח]ר יקחנה ובלוקחו אותה יעשה כמ[ש]פט [ולוא] יגיד עליה[ה]

And if 8 [a man gives his daughter to a ma]n, let him disclose all her blemishes to him, lest he bring upon himself the judgement 9 [of the curse which is said] (of the one) that 'makes the blind to wander out of the way.' (Deut 27:18) Moreover, he should not give her to one unfit for her, for 10 [that is *kil'ayim*, (ploughing with) o]x and ass and wearing wool and linen together. vac Let no man bring 11 [a woman into the ho]ly [covenant?] who has had sexual experience, (whether) she had such 12 [experience in the home] of her

(2) Text and translation from F. García Martínez – E. Tigchelaar, *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden-Grand Rapids, 2000) II, 796-799.

(3) Text and translation from J.M. Baumgarten, *The Damascus Document* (4Q266-273) (DJD XVIII, Oxford, 1996), 175-176.

father or as a widow who had intercourse after she was widowed. And any **13** [woman upon whom there is a] bad [na]me in her maidenhood in her father's home, let no man take her, except **14** [upon examination] by trustworthy [women] of repute selected by command of the supervisor over **15** [the many. After]ward he may take her, and when he takes her he shall act in accordance with the l[a]w [and he shall not t]ell about [her].

Shemesh perceives an ideological affinity between the Qumran prohibition against the marriage of a priest to an Israelite woman, and the rabbinic counsel to the same effect. In this, it appears he is influenced by the rabbinic midrashic method of *קל וחומר* *Kal Wehomer*, a rhetorical trope opposed by Qumran (which sees it as a problematic mode of exegesis *דורשי חלקות*). Moreover, such an approach does not take into account the simple meaning of the Qumranic text; since priests and laics are of different species, the prohibition of their mating is included in the biblical prohibition against breeding different species of animals. Thus, the prohibition against the marriage of a priest and an Israelite woman is not the result of a rabbinic Midrash, but rather a logical extension of the biblical prohibitions against interbreeding animals. This is similar to the Qumranic prohibition against consuming the blood of fish (*CD XII 13–14*), derived from Scripture's prohibition against the consumption of *כל דם* "all blood." (4) The rabbinic midrashic method, in contrast, permits consumption of fish blood (*m. Ker. 5: 1, b. Ker. 20b*). Thus it is clear that the motive behind Qumran's intermarriage prohibition is based on a perceived genealogical distinction, while the rabbinic recommendation is concerned with the ramifications of marriage between individuals of disparate educational and social ranks.

Shemesh cites Rabbi Johanan's assertion, (5) that "[the marriage of] a priest's daughter to an Israelite does not bode well" and the subsequent qualifying (6) statement, which explains that this refers to an ignoramus (rather than a sage, for whom, he suggests marriage with the daughter of a priest is appropriate and even desirable). This supports my argument that a pragmatic issue was at the heart of the rabbinic recommendation regarding intermarriage between the priest and the Israelite woman, one based on social ranking and its ramifications for marital compatibility. The Rabbis compare the union of the daughter of a priest and an ignorant man to poor quality wine which is made from combining superior and inferior grapes, while the union of a priest's daughter with a Sage is compared to fine wine, which is made from a mixture of two superior level grapes. The combining of these grapes poses no problem with respect to the issue of *כלאים*,

(4) We read in *Lev 7:27*: *ככל נפש אשר תאכל כל דם ונכרתה הנפש ההוא מעמיה* "If anyone eats blood, that person must be cut off from his people."

(5) We read in *b. Pesah. 49a*: *בת כהן לישראל אין זוגין עולה יפה*.

(6) *הא בתלמיד חכם הא בעם הארץ*

implied by the dictum from *Sifre* that Shemesh cites, which states that the elders must dissuade an old man from taking in levirate a young girl (and the same for a young man taking in levirate an older woman), for fear that the age gap can lead to bickering between the couple. It is not mere coincidence that Qumran, as support for its prohibition against intermarriage between a priest and an Israelite woman, cites the command in *Lev* 19:19 (13) about mating different species of animals. To support the suggestion against marrying an ill-suited woman Qumran cites the dictum in *Deut* 22:10-11 (14) regarding plowing with different animals and not wearing clothes of wool and flax. The laws of כלאים in *Leviticus* (cited as support for the Qumranic ban on intermarriage between a priest and an Israelite woman) are described as having the attribute of a חוק, a law whose motive is concealed, according to the Rabbis. The laws found in *Deuteronomy* (cited to support the advice against an ill-suited marriage), however, are not described as *Khok*, which suggests that they are understood to have a rational foundation. The discrepancy between the two citations, then, seems to underscore my argument that these two “rules” or “decrees” are of distinct types. (It is plausible that these discrepancies were known to Qumran.) Moreover, while 4QMMT quotes all the three prohibited mixtures from *Leviticus*, 4Q271, concerning the ill-suited marriage, it omits the first verse of the Deuteronomic lemma, which refers to the prohibition against combining distinct sowing seeds in the vineyard. This distinction between the supporting verses suggests differences in the nature of the two rules. Whereas plowing various seeds together, and breeding animals of two distinct species are actions that have an effect on future offspring, the same is obviously not true of plowing with two different animals yoked together. The prohibition against such act can be understood as a biblical mandate against causing animals to suffer. (15) Thus, the differences between the supporting verses are indicative of the dissimilarity between the two rulings. There is no inherent biological mixture that occurs in either the use of two different species of animals for plowing, nor in the wearing of flax and wool together, and therefore the transgression of either prohibition does not

(13) See text in n. 5 XXX.

(14) We read in *Deut* 22:9-11: הורע לא תורע כרמך כלאים פן תקדש המלאה הורע (9) אשר תורע ותבואת הכרם (10). לא תחרש בשור ובחמור יחדיו (11). לא תלבש שעטנן צמר ופשתים יחדיו. “Do not plant two kinds of seed [Kilayim] in your vineyard if you do not only the crops you plant but also the fruit of the vineyard will be defiled. 10. Do not plow with an ox and a donkey yoked together. 11. Do not wear clothes of wool and linen woven together.”

(15) We observe that *Temple Scroll*, 11Q19 LII 12-13, mentions two rules that are related, as both are motivated by a desire to avoid animal suffering: ולוא תחסום שור על דישו ולוא תחרוש בשור ובחמור יחדיו “And you shall not muzzle an ox when it treads out the grain and you shall not plough with an ox and an ass together.”

affect a negative result. (16) Logical reasoning—to avoid animal suffering by not combining animals of differing physical capacities—lies behind the biblical rule. Thus, this is appropriate support for the advice against an ill-suited union, in the interest of avoiding potential conflict and disharmony. (17) In fact, the term **כְּלָאִים** is not mentioned in *Deut* with respect to these two prohibitions, which are cited as support for our rule. In contrast, *Lev* 19:19, which supports the intermarriage of priests, repeats the term *Kilaiim* for each of the three types of mixtures. I can only speculate that 4Q271 added the term **כְּלָאִים**, absent in Scripture in the two quoted prohibitions, because of some sort of dittography or contamination.

It is also worth noting that the author includes in this lemma two additional rules that constitute good advice, as they are not associated with any consequence. Since this rule appears in the same lemma, it seems reasonable to assume that it is of a similar character and is not a law but simply a suggestion. More specifically, the recommendation not to marry one's daughter to an inappropriate man, subject of our inquiry, is similar in its character to the antecedent rule, which recommends that all of the bride's faults be divulged to the bridegroom, and to the subsequent suggestions against marrying a woman with a bad reputation. These all constitute pragmatic advice regarding ethical behavior, rather than legally binding rules, and noncompliance with these suggestions has no legal ramifications. Indeed, it is no accident that the harsh term **זוֹת** (which does appear in the prohibition against a priest marrying an Israelite) is omitted here.

A complex rabbinic mode of reasoning underlies Shemesh's interpretation of **הוֹכֵן לָהּ** as “dedicated,” a term whose legal weight is dubious, as it merely prohibits marrying off one's daughter to one other than the man to whom she has been dedicated, but not betrothed. Shemesh alleges that the woman is assumed of having had intercourse with the man to whom she has been dedicated (such conduct was occasionally sanctioned in some communities, according to a mishna [*Ket.* 1: 5]). (18) The mishna, however, clearly refers to a

(16) There are various speculations about the plausible motive for this prohibition. The peculiarity that the rule relates exclusively to clothes of flax and wool, not to a mixture of other materials, demonstrates that this prohibition is not due to an act against the divine creation of distinct species. The Rabbis assume that the priestly garments were composed of flax and wool. Therefore, it is plausible that Scripture forbids to make such garments for laymen, like the prohibition to prepare anointing oil with the same formula as for the sacred use (*Ex* 30:32).

(17) Although I do not have solid evidence as to whether the suggestion against marrying an unsuitable woman constitutes advice or whether it is in fact a strict prohibition, I think it is safe to assume the former, since no legal sanctions or consequences are indicated.

(18) We read there: **הָאוֹכֵל אֶצֶל חָמּוֹ בִּיהוּדָה שְׁלֹא בְעֵדִים אֵינוּ יִכּוֹל לִטְעֹן טַעַנְתָּ** *האוכל אצל חמו ביהודה שלא בעדים אינו יכול לטעון טענתך* “The bridegroom, who ate at his [future] father in law in Judah, [before his marriage] without the presence of witnesses, cannot claim that his

previously betrothed woman. (19) Shemesh asserts that according to Qumran law, once a woman has had intercourse with a man, irrespective of intention or motive, the couple is considered legally married. Therefore, the woman is forbidden to marry another man. The prohibition against marrying a woman dedicated to another man, and the rule that forbids marrying an unwed or widowed woman who is suspected of having had intercourse in the house of her father are identical, as in both cases the woman's status, in terms of her availability, is that of a married woman, and her marrying another man would constitute a cardinal sin punishable by death.

However, the literary style of the rule does not support Shemesh's interpretation. Indeed, one would expect to read the term *הוכן לה* in an affirmative mode: "one should not give [his daughter] to a man, other than he to whom she was promised," but, instead we encounter the following: "one should not give [his daughter] to whom she was not promised" in a negative mode. There is no positive mention in the text of another man, which, according to Shemesh's interpretation is the core of the dictum. The suggestion that the prohibition is based on the fact that this union constitutes a type of *Kilayim* is clearly not relevant, as intercourse with a married woman is not an issue of forbidden combinations but rather constitutes adultery, a cardinal sin. Shemesh's complex interpretation stands in contradistinction to Qumran's typically straightforward explanations.

The comparison of intermarriage between priests and Israelites to the biblical prohibitions of *כלאים* is a logical one. Holy (all Israelites) and most holy (the priests) represent two distinct cosmological categories, such as those engendered by innate differences between the various species of animals and plants. Therefore, intermarriage between the two is forbidden. Similarly, Qumran's suggestion against marrying one who is "ill-suited," is also founded on a simple and logical exegesis of the biblical command against plowing with two types of animals. Shemesh's conclusions, however, are not true to the simple meaning of the text, and his interpretation is clearly based on a complex system of interpretation established by the Rabbis. While I do not take issue with rabbinic exegesis per se, I think it is a mistake to apply such complex modes of interpretation to Qumran.

bride was not a virgin, because he may have had intercourse with her. " *B. Ketub.* 12a stresses that this rule is valid only in some places in Judah, in which staying at one's father-in-law was common, but not in other places. Shemesh alleges tacitly that the same circumstances were en vogue in the Qumran community a few hundred years earlier, in a society whose members practiced extreme chastity and were under the constant supervision by of the Controller.

(19) The mishna calls the father of the bride "his father-in-law." Moreover, the succeeding mishna 6 discusses the legal consequences of a controversy whether she lost her virginity before her betrothal or after it.

Shemesh's theory is founded on the concept of the rabbinic preventative measure referred to as שְׂמָא "perhaps," which prohibits the permitted out of fear that the permitted deed may inadvertently cause one to commit a forbidden action. The Rabbis classify such preventative prohibitions separately from the apodictic Torah commands, but the very concept of a two-tier decree does not appear in Qumran halakhah. Further, if a woman was betrothed to a man when she was only a young girl, years before the actual marriage (as was the custom), she would be considered liable for capital punishment (for adultery) if she had intercourse with another man in the period between her betrothal and her marriage. However, according to Shemesh this was the case even if the woman was never betrothed, but merely had intercourse with two different men. Shemesh confirms (p. 190) that, in his opinion a woman who was never betrothed, but merely had intercourse with two different men is liable for capital punishment of adultery. However, he ignores the fact that 4Q271 cites as biblical support the prohibition against forming certain types of "mixtures," rather than the prohibition against adultery *Deut* 22:22, (20) which would be the more appropriate citation.

Shemesh builds his theory by alleging that the capital punishment cited in 4Q159 II 4-8, (21) refers to a woman about whom it is discovered, upon her marriage, that she was not a virgin. He assumes that Qumran perceives the stoning execution of *Deut* 22, the source of Qumran's halakhah, as relating to an unengaged woman, because intercourse with a man before her wedding is legally considered a marriage. The lack of her virginity is evidence of her intercourse. Such halakhah contradicts the rabbinic opinion that the biblical command relates exclusively to a מְאֲרָשָׁה, an "engaged woman." The case refers to the betrothed man, who has paid the woman's father the price of the bride, and is founded on the succeeding rules in *Deut* 22:23-29, which differentiate between the consequences of intercourse with a מְאֲרָשָׁה "engaged" and לֹא אֲרָשָׁה "unengaged" girl. (22)

(20) We read there: *כי ימצא איש שכב עם אשה בעלת בעל ומתו גם שניהם האיש השכב עם האשה והאשה* "If man is found sleeping with another man's wife, both the man who slept with her and the woman must die."

(21) We read there: *כי יוצי איש שם רע על בתולה ישרא[ל]אם ביום קחתו אותה* "Should a man malign an Isra[e]lite virgin, if on th[e day] of his taking her he says (it), then [women] shall examine her who are reliable. If he has not lied regarding her, then she shall be put to death."

(22) We read in v. 23: *כי יהיה נער בתולה מארשה לאיש ומצאה איש בעיר ושכב עמה* "If a man happens to meet in a town a virgin pledged to be married and he sleeps with her." The consequence is that both are executed. We also read in v. 28: *כי ימצא איש נער בתולה אשר לא ארשה ותפשה ושכב עמה ונמצאו* "If a man happens to meet a virgin who is not pledged to be married and rapes her and they are discovered." In this circumstance, not being engaged, the sole consequence is the obligation of the man to marry the woman and he can never divorce her.

I think it is dubious that Qumran would have interpreted *Deut* 22:20-21 as Shemesh alleges, disregarding the seemingly contrary scriptural dicta, whose explicit requisite for a conviction of adultery is that the woman be an “engaged woman,” as explained above. We read in *Ex* 22:15-16 (23) that a man seducing a virgin, must marry her or pay her father the bride price of a virgin, since the remuneration the father would receive by marrying her to another man would be less than he would receive if she were still a virgin. Scripture does not mention that he must divorce her, if her father opposes her marriage to the seducer, as stated in similar circumstances in *Deut* 24:1. (24) Moreover, since according to Qumran, divorces are invalid, it seems unlikely that a father would cause his seduced daughter to remain unmarried, especially since she is, in any case, legally married to her seducer.

According to Shemesh, then, in the case of a woman dedicated to a man, or in that of an unwed or widowed woman who has already had intercourse with a man, if another man should marry any of these, both the man and the woman would be liable and sentenced to capital punishment. However, there is no mention of any kind of further retribution, specifically in terms of the ramifications for any offspring of the union; there is no indication that a child conceived by two such individuals would be a ממזר. This is puzzling because in the case of an intermarriage between a priest and an Israelite, a lesser transgression than adultery, the defilement of the offspring is indicated in 4Q396 IV 10: [את זרע] הקודש “and pollute the holy seed.” This significant point indicates the difference between the rules of 4Q271 that concern practical and ethical issues, apparently without concrete sanctions, and 4Q159 and 4QMMT, which relate to transgressions of primary laws that incur severe legal consequences.

Moreover, according to my interpretation the omission of the divorcee from 4Q271 is not surprising, as hers is a distinct legal status unlike that of the widowed, dedicated, and unwed women listed in the lemma. The divorcee and her new husband would be convicted for adultery, according to Qumran law, but the women mentioned in 4Q271, and their bridegrooms, would not suffer any legal consequences.

However, according to Shemesh, there is no difference between these various women. The man marrying a divorcee would be liable for capital punishment for his intercourse with a married woman, since Qumran halakhah does not recognize the validity of a divorce.

(23) We read there: וכי יפתה איש בתולה אשר לא ארשה ושכב עמה מהר ימהרנה לו: ולאשה אם מאן ימאן אביה לתתה לו כסף ישקל כמהר הבתולת.

(24) We read there: כי יקח איש אשה ובעלה והיה אם לא תמצא חן בעיניו כי מצא בה: ערות דבר וכתב לה ספר כריתת ונתן בידה ושלחה מביתו “If a man marries a woman who becomes displeasing to him because he finds something indecent about her, and he writes her a certificate of divorce, gives it to her and sends her from his house.”

Similarly, all the women mentioned in the lemma, and a man having intercourse with any one of them, would be liable. This is because the women are considered legally married once they have had casual intercourse with a man. Hence, according to Shemesh's interpretation, they are of the same category, and the divorcee should have appeared in this lemma. Furthermore, 4Q271 does not mention an identical punishment for the man, as one would expect from a voluntary adulterous act. Shemesh is aware of this, and explains that the man is absolved from punishment, since he acted unintentionally, not being aware of her past. This argument conflicts with the text, which explicitly states that her sexual activity was well-known. The phrase *אשר נשכבה* indicates sexual experience, as J. M. Baumgarten translates, (25) as does the succeeding affirmative phrase *שם רע* "who had intercourse." Both expressions imply facts, in contrast to the next case in which the more vague expression *שם רע* "a bad name" is used. In this case, the author indicates the possibility that the defamation was not true.

To explain his theory, according to which Qumran perceives unwed and unengaged women who have had intercourse as being married, Shemesh asserts that Qumran is extending to all Israelites the scriptural prohibition against priests marrying prostitutes and "defiled" women, because they are considered legally married. I believe that this assumption is unwarranted. *Lev* 21 refers unequivocally to priests and only to priests, and it is implausible that Qumran, which so strongly emphasized the distinction between priests and Israelites, would effect such equalizing halakhic procedure. To support his theory, Shemesh quotes the rabbinic extension of *Lev* 21:5 "Priests must not shave their heads or shave off the edges of their beards or cut their bodies" to include all Israelites, although *Deut* 14:1 prohibits only the shaving of the Israelite's forefront (between the eyes). (26) But Qumran does not extend the prohibitions of *Deut* 21 to the Israelites. 11Q19 XLVIII 7-8 quotes the text from *Deut*, prohibiting solely shaving the forefront of Israelites. (27) Thus it is evident that Qumran does not practice the rabbinic midrashic system and there is no basis for citing "*Gzerah Shavah*" or *Kal Wehomer*.

Moreover, the text of *Lev* 21:7 and 14-15, which prohibits a priest from marrying a divorced or defiled woman, as well as a prostitute, and which forbids the High Priest from marrying any non-virgin, including a widow, cannot be reconciled with Shemesh's alle-

(25) *DJD* XVIII, 176.

(26) We read here *בְּנֵי אֱתֶם לַה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לֹא תַתְּגַדְּדוּ וְלֹא תַשְׂיִמוּ קִרְחָה בֵּין עֵינֵיכֶם* "You are the children of the Lord your God. Do not cut yourselves or shave the front of your heads for the dead."

(27) We read there: *כִּי עַם קֹדֶשׁ אַתָּה לַה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם בְּנֵי אֱתֶם לַה' אֱלֹהֵיכֶם לֹא תַתְּגַדְּדוּ וְלֹא תַשְׂיִמוּ קִרְחָה בֵּין עֵינֵיכֶם* "You are the sons of the Lord your God; you shall not cut yourselves or make any baldness on your foreheads for the dead."

gation. Scripture does not indicate the consequence of a priest marrying a divorcee, but indicates the reasoning behind this law, which is his holy status. (28) Only the succeeding *Lev* 21:15 indicates its consequence, which is the defilement of his offspring, (29) followed by an explanation which is that God sanctified him, and not that the woman is legally married. The priest is not considered to be defiled by his prohibited marriage. (30) According to Shemesh's understanding of Qumran halakhah, both the simple priest and the High Priest would be liable for execution for marrying a prostitute, who had intercourse with many men, and she would be liable for execution for her sexual activity after her first intercourse. Such conclusions cannot be reconciled with a simple understanding of the biblical text and it is implausible to suggest that Qumran would ignore the biblical text.

In this paper, I sought to demonstrate some of the problems raised by imposing rabbinic modes of exegesis on Qumran halakhic corpus. Comparison of the two distinct systems is important and often indispensable for understanding Qumran's intended mode of interpretation. However, such comparison should serve, in most instances, to emphasize both the differences and the similarities, and special care should be taken to avoid problems that typically arise when attempting to interpret vague biblical texts and lacunae.

Paul HEGER

(28) We read in *Lev* 21:7: **אִשָּׁה זֶנָּה וְחִלְלָה לֹא יִקְחוּ וְאִשָּׁה גְרוּשָׁה מֵאִשָּׁה לֹא יִקְחוּ כִּי קֹדֶשׁ הוּא לֵאלֹהֵי** "They must not marry women defiled by prostitution or divorced from their husbands, because priests are holy to their God."

(29) We read in *Lev* 21:15: **וְלֹא יִחְלֹל וְרָעוּ בְּעַמּוֹ כִּי אֲנִי ה' מְקֹדְשׁוֹ** "so he will not defile his offspring among his people. I am the Lord, who makes him holy."

(30) The Rabbis declare it explicitly in *b. Sota* 23:2: **כֹּהֵן אֵין מִתְחַלֵּל מִגֵּזֶל דְּאָמַר** "the priest is not defiled [by a prohibited marriage]. How do we know it? [Since] it is said he will not defile his offspring [and that means] he defiles his offspring [by such marriage] but he is not defiled." From the text in *4Q396*, cited above, we may also deduce a similar attitude by Qumran. We read therein v. 10: **וּמִטְמְאִים אֶת זֶרְעָן הַקֹּדֶשׁ וְאֶת אֶת [זֶרְעָן] עִם הַזֶּהוּ** "and defile the [holy] seed [and also] their (own) [seed] with fornications." There is no mention of the priest's defilement through a prohibited marriage; but only of that of his offspring. The many accusations of defilement because of evil deeds refer to the temple, not to the priests or sinners, such as: *IQpHab* XII 8-9; **וְלֹא יִגְאֻלוּ אֶת מִקְדָּשׁוֹ** (*11Q19* XLVII 13).

דגים (*IQIsa^a* 15:11): FISCHER

IN *IQIsa^a* 15:11 findet sich דגים (korrigiert aus דגין), (1) während im Masoretischen Text (MT) דָּגִים steht (*Jes* 19,8). Nach Kutscher (2) sei דִּיגִים durch דגים ersetzt worden, obwohl das keinen Sinn gebe. Das Wort דגים in der Bedeutung „Fische“ gibt hier in der Tat keinen Sinn. Ich schlage vor, die Form דגים als Partizip aktiv *qal* des Verbs דיג zu interpretieren.

Von der Wurzel דיג gibt es vereinzelt ein *nomen agentis* im *mišqal* קָטַל. Im MT findet sich das erwähnte דִּיגִים, *Jes* 19,8 (in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des MT auch דוּגִים geschrieben), (3) außerdem דִּיגִים, (4) *Jer* 16,16 (*qre*) – דוּגִים, *Jer* 16,16 (*ktiv*) und דִּיגִים, *Ez* 47,10 (in der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des MT auch דִּיגִים oder דִּיגִים geschrieben). (5) In den biblischen Qumran-Rollen ist *Jes* 19,8 neben der erwähnten Stelle aus *IQIsa^a* noch in *4QIsa^b* 10-13 erhalten, und zwar wie im MT in der Form דִּיגִים. In den nicht-biblischen Qumran-Rollen findet sich einmal das Wort דִּיגִים (*IQH^a* 13:8, *yod* und *waw* sind nicht sicher zu unterscheiden). *Jer* 16,16 und *Ez* 47,10 sind in Qumran nirgends erhalten. Im mischnischen Hebräisch findet sich kein Beleg für die Form דִּיג. (6)

Nomina agentis im *mišqal* קָטַל sind in den Handschriften von Qumran zwar nicht häufig, aber sie sind bekannt. In den nicht-biblischen sind sie ca. 20 Mal belegt. (7) Im Biblischen Hebräisch finden

(1) D. W. Parry, E. Qimron (Hgg.), *The Great Isaiah Scroll (IQIsa^a): A New Edition* (STDJ 32; Leiden, 1999), 31.

(2) E. Y. Kutscher, *The Language and Linguistic Background of the Isaiah Scroll (IQIsa^a)* (STDJ 6; Leiden, 1974), 38.

(3) M. H. Goshen-Gottstein (Hg.), *The Hebrew University Bible Project*, Jerusalem seit 1995 (HUB), ad loc.

(4) Nach HUB ohne *dageš*, aber sowohl die Codices Leningradensis und Aleppo als auch BHS vokalisieren die Form mit *dageš*.

(5) HUB, ad loc.

(6) Kutscher, *Language*, 38.

(7) Genauer gesagt erschließbar aus dem Vorkommen der entsprechenden Wörter in vokalisierten Texten.

sich solche *nomina agentis* von ca. 20 Wurzeln, (8) einige von ihnen wechseln mit Partizipien im *mišqal* קָטַל, ohne daß immer ein klarer Bedeutungsunterschied zu erkennen wäre. (9) In den biblischen Qumran-Rollen ist der *mišqal* קָטַל immer קָטַל geschrieben. Es ist zwar nicht auszuschließen, daß dies als defektiv geschriebenes Partizip קָטַל verstanden wurde (der *mišqal* קָטַל ist in den biblischen Qumran-Rollen in ungefähr einem Drittel der Fälle defektiv geschrieben, in *IQIsa^a* seltener), aber es findet sich kein Fall, in welchem eine Form קָטַל des MT in einem Qumran-Manuskript als קָטַל wiedergegeben wäre. In der Mischna gibt es ein mögliches Beispiel für einen Wechsel zwischen dem *mišqal* קָטַל und einem Partizip einer Wurzel *II.yod*: In Sanh IV:1 (nach dem Codex Kaufmann) ist zweimal יָדָה geschrieben, mit durch Punktierung getilgtem (ersten) *yod*.

Eine Verbform der Wurzel דיג ist nur in וְדִיגוּם, *Jer* 16,16, (10) belegt. Diese Stelle ist in keiner biblischen Handschrift vom Toten Meer erhalten. In anderen Quellen aus der Zeit des Zweiten Tempels findet sich keine verbale Verwendung dieser Wurzel, auch nicht in der Mischna. Ein Partizip dieser Wurzel ist nirgends bezeugt.

Formell und phonetisch ist die Form דִּיגִים in den Verwendungen „Fische“ und „Fischer“ identisch. Die masoretische Vokalisierung (11) gibt folgendes Bild: Das Substantiv דִּיג ist in dieser Form nur drei Mal im Buch Jona belegt, einmal kommt es in der Schreibung דָּאג vor (*Neh* 13,16). Der Plural (*status absolutus*) ist דִּיגִים vokalisiert, im *status constructus* דִּיגִי, d. h. das *qamaš* ist wandelbar. Es gibt eine feminine Form דִּיגָה, im *status constructus* דִּיגָת. Es sind keine Formen für das Maskulin mit Suffix belegt. Das hypothetische Partizip der Wurzel דיג (oder דוג) wäre ebenfalls דִּיג* vokalisiert, mit festem *qamaš*, d. h. der Plural *constructus* lautete דִּיגִי*.

Die Entwicklung von דִּיגִים zur Form דִּיגִים kann phonetisch und graphisch erklärt werden. Ein Schreiber mag in seiner Vorlage דִּיגִים gelesen haben, erklärbar durch die Ähnlichkeit von *yod* und *waw* in vielen Manuskripten. Das *waw* kann dann als *mater lectionis* für *ā* interpretiert worden sein. Für eine solche *mater lectionis* finden sich einige mögliche Beispiele in den Qumran-Rollen, z. B. הַנוּמָה, *IQIsa^a* 35:7 (MT: הַנִּמָּה, *Jes* 41,27), (12) auch einige (allerdings problemati-

(8) H. Bauer, P. Leander, *Historische Grammatik der hebräischen Sprache des Alten Testaments* (Halle: 1922), 479.

(9) B. Kedar-Kopfstein, „Semantic Aspects of the Pattern qōṭēl“, *Hebrew Annual Review* 1 (1977), 158, bringt als Beispiele dafür die Wurzeln חָבַר, חָרַשׁ und רָקַח.

(10) In der handschriftlichen Überlieferung des MT auch als *piel* vokalisiert (HUB, ad loc.)

(11) Der Mischna-Codex Kaufmann vokalisiert in allen Belegen (es gibt keine für *status constructus* Feminin oder Plural) entsprechend der Vokalisierung des MT.

(12) Weitere Beispiele: E. Qimron, *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Harvard Semitic Studies; Atlanta 1986), 39-40. Nach ihm ist dieser Wechsel möglicherweise phonetisch zu erklären durch einen benachbarten Liquid oder Labial. Diese Erklärung greift für seine Beispiele, nicht aber für דִּיגִים.

sche) für Partizipien *qal* von Wurzeln *II.yod*: בּוֹאִים, *IQ28a* 1:4; (13) בּוֹאֵת, *3Q15* 1:2 (14) und das fragmentarische בּוֹשֵׁ, *4Q416* 2 ii 20 (möglicherweise Adjektiv). (15)

Das Wort דג kann im Kontext aller anderen Vorkommen (im MT, in den Qumran-Rollen und in der Mischna) als „Fisch“ verstanden worden, eine Interpretation als „Fischer“ ist nirgends nötig. Die LXX übersetzt in *Ij* 40,31 (nur dort) das Wort mit ἁλιεύς (Fischer), der Kontext ermöglicht beides. (16)

Die Schreibung דגין vor der Korrektur in דגים kann verschieden erklärt werden. Man kann die Maskulin-Plural-Endung ין als Aramaismus ansehen, oder man erklärt den Wechsel zwischen auslautendem *mem* und *nun* phonetisch. (17) Daraus kann man keine Rückschlüsse auf die Deutung als Partizip oder als Substantiv ziehen. Es sei aber hier darauf hingewiesen, daß es mehrere andere Texte gibt, bei welchen die Maskulin-Plural-Endung ין am Partizip mehr verbreitet ist als an anderen Nominalformen:

- In der *Vision Gabriels* (18) enden Partizipien im Maskulin Plural immer (vier Belege) auf ין. Diese Endung ist auch bei anderen Nominalformen belegt, dort ist aber ים häufiger (ין: 5x; ים: 9x).
- Im hebräischen Text *5/6Hev* 49 (19) findet sich die Endung ין viermal am Partizip. In diesem Text ist keine andere Nominal-Endung ים oder ין belegt. Finales *mem* des klassischen Hebräisch ist entweder beibehalten (z. B. שלום, 1:2) oder als *nun* wiedergegeben (in den Pronomina und Pronominal-Suffixen im Maskulin Plural, z. B. אתן, 1:3).

(13) J. T. Milik (*DJD* 1, 112) schlägt vor, das *yod* zu streichen und das Wort als Infinitiv zu lesen oder (weniger wahrscheinlich) das *waw* zu streichen und das Wort als Partizip zu lesen.

(14) Die *Kupferrolle* unterscheidet sich sprachlich und stilistisch von den meisten anderen Qumran-Rollen.

(15) Ein mögliches Beispiel aus dem *Damaskus-Dokument* aus der Kairoer Geniza ist מביאי, *CD* 9:2. E. Qimron, „The Text of CDC“, M. Broshi (Hg.), *The Damascus Document Reconsidered*, Jerusalem 1992, 27, bemerkt dazu: “4QD^e reads מבאי; perhaps one might read מבואי, a by-form of מבאי”. F. García Martínez, E. J. C. Tigchelaar (Hgg.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition* (Leiden u. a., 1997/1998), 564, korrigieren dagegen zu מביאי. Ein vergleichbarer Fall aus dem *Samari-tanus* ist קומיהם (*Ex* 32,25; MT: קמיהם).

(16) In *Zef* 1,10 übersetzt die LXX zwar mit einem Partizip (ἀποκεντούντων), aber sie übersetzt wohl eine andere Vorlage, nicht הדגים, wie im MT, sondern הרלוגים.

(17) Siehe dazu Qimron, *Hebrew*, 27. In *IQIsa^d* gibt es für die Endung ין anstelle der Endung ים des MT nur ein weiteres Beispiel: ציין, 18:19 (MT: ציים, *Jes* 23,13).

(18) A. Yardeni, B. Elitzur, הודעה: המאה הראשונה לפנה״ס, *Cathedra* 123 (2007), 155-166. Der Text kann auf das Ende des 1. Jh. v. Chr. datiert werden.

(19) Y. Yadin u. a. (Hgg.), *The Documents from the Bar Kokhba Period in the Cave of Letters: Hebrew, Aramaic and Nabatean-Aramaic Papyri* (Judean Desert Studies; Jerusalem, 2002), 279-286.

- In der Mischna ist die Maskulin-Plural-Endung ך am Partizip häufig, v. a. im Traktat *Kil'aim*. (20)
- In der *Tosefta* ist die Maskulin-Plural-Endung des Partizips regelmäßig ך. (21)

Diese Texte freilich können für *IQIsa^a* nur eingeschränkt als Vergleich herangezogen werden, da sie jünger sind (*IQIsa^a* kann auf das ausgehende 2. Jh. v. Chr. (22) datiert werden).

Der Vorschlag, ך als Partizip *qal* der Wurzel ךׁ in der Bedeutung „Fischer“ zu verstehen, löst also das semantische Problem des Textes von *IQIsa^a* 15:11. Diese Interpretation ist sprachlich möglich, meines Erachtens auch wahrscheinlich, sie ist aber nicht zwingend.

Gregor GEIGER

(20) S. Naeh, "שתי סוגיות נדרשות בלשון חז"ל", M. Bar-Asher, D. Rosenthal (Hgg.), *Mehqerei Talmud: Talmudic Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Professor Eliezer Shimshon Rosenthal*, Jerusalem 1993, 385-387; nach ihm sei dieser Unterschied eine Schreiberkonvention, um phonetisch identische Verbal- und Nominalformen graphisch zu unterscheiden.

(21) O. Ruiz Morell, „Tosefta Sotah: morfosintaxis del participio“, *Simposio Bíblico Español* 4,1 (1993), 328.

(22) B. Webster, „Chronological Index of the Texts from the Judaean Desert“, *DJD* 39, 372.

RECENSIONS

Qoumrân et le judaïsme du tournant de notre ère: actes de la Table ronde, Collège de France, 16 novembre 2004, sous la direction de ANDRÉ LEMAIRE et SIMON C. MIMOUNI (Collection de la Revue des études juives, 40), Leuven, Peeters, 2006, 16 x 24, x + 153 pages. Relié. 38 €. ISBN 90 429 1760 1.

Ce volume dirigé par André Lemaire et Simon C. Mimouni rassemble les actes de la Table ronde tenues au collège de France le 16 novembre 2004 et dédiées à André Caquot (1923–2004). L'objectif était de faire le point sur certaines pratiques et croyances des gens de Qumrân à partir des données des manuscrits et de l'archéologie. Onze contributions sont ainsi rassemblées.

Dans la première, André Lemaire retrace, en hommage, les recherches d'André Caquot dans le domaine qumrânien depuis ses premières travaux sur le messianisme en 1967–68 jusqu'à ses traductions annotées et ses études synthétiques publiées dans le *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* entre 1992 et 2004.

Simon Mimouni dresse ensuite un état de la question sur la bibliothèque et l'établissement de Qoumrân. Il présente d'abord les différentes hypothèses concernant les origines des manuscrits: esséniennes (E. L. Sukenik, A. Dupond-Sommer, R. de Vaux), hiérosolymitaines (N. Golb), qumrâniennes (F. García Martínez, A. S. van der Woude), sadducéennes (L. H. Schiffman). Il expose ensuite les polémiques concernant le site archéologique: une forteresse judéenne (N. Golb), une *villa rustica* (R. et P. Donceel), une fabrique de manuscrits (H. Stegemann), une ferme hasmonéenne puis un centre essénien (J.-B. Humbert), un port, un poste de douane et une auberge (A. D. Crown et L. Cansdale), un centre de purification rituelle (E. M. Cook), une maison forte à caractère agricole (Y. Hirschfeld). On regrette que l'auteur ne présente pas une évaluation critique de ces hypothèses, en effet, toutes ne se valant pas (voir par exemple les remarques de D. Dimant, p. 21, et d'É. Puech, p. 86 de ce même ouvrage). On regrette également une présentation assez sélective des auteurs, pourquoi ne pas avoir mentionné également les travaux de J. Magness, M. Broshi ou Y. Magen?

La contribution suivante est la traduction française d'un article de Devorah Dimant publié dans M. Bar-Asher, D. Dimant (éd.), *Meghillot. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, volume II, Haïfa-Jérusalem, 2004, pp. 21–36 [hébreu]. D. Dimant cherche à montrer que l'interprétation d'Is 40,3 en

1QS VIII 12–16 concernant l'exil au désert ne renvoie pas à un désert réel, en l'occurrence le site de Qumrân, mais doit être compris dans un sens spirituel relatif à l'étude de la Torah. Cette démonstration remettrait en cause l'établissement du maître de Justice à Qumrân et poserait ainsi de nouvelles questions quant à l'histoire de la communauté.

Florentino García Martínez s'intéresse ensuite à la conception de «l'autre» et à la formulation de l'identité de la communauté qui a produit le *Document de Damas*. Il montre que ce groupe se considère comme faisant partie d'une «alliance nouvelle». Cette dernière trace une frontière au sein même d'Israël: n'en est membre que celui qui est fidèle à tous les préceptes tels que Dieu les leur a révélés (CD III 12–16). Mais ce groupe élitaire, ce «reste d'Israël» demeure néanmoins ouvert à tous ceux qui décident de se joindre à ce mouvement réformiste, y compris les étrangers résidents, les גרים (CD XIV 3–6).

Francis Schmidt porte son attention sur la dimension astrologique du terme *môlad* qu'il propose de traduire par «géniture». Il examine en particulier son sens en 4Q*Instruction* et montre qu'il y est étroitement lié au *raz nihyeh*. De fait, le terme est attesté à plusieurs reprises dans ce manuscrit. Néanmoins, il nous paraît légitime de nuancer cette dimension astrologique du terme dans ce rouleau. En effet, le syntagme בית מולדים n'est attesté qu'une seule fois (4Q415 2 ii 9) de façon isolée et sans contexte suffisant pour en déterminer le sens avec certitude. La traduction des éditeurs, «the house where thou wert born», paraît ainsi également possible (voir en particulier la construction parallèle à la ligne 7 du même fragment: בבית מכורותיך «in the house of [thy] orig[ins]»). L'expression syriaque «bêt-yaldo» apparaît trop tardivement dans la littérature pour constituer un argument capital. Concernant le terme מולד, le sens d'«origine» en 4Q417 2 i 11 («saisis les origines du salut et sache qui héritera de la gloire et de l'élévation») et en 4Q416 2 iii 9 (par. 4Q418 9+9a–c 8, «et dans le mystère de l'existence, cherche ses origines») (l'antécédent du pronom suffixe est ambigu) ou le sens de «descendant» en 4Q415 11 11 et en 4Q416 2 iii 20 (par. 4Q418 10ab 3) à propos de la femme, semblent tout aussi possibles.

André Lemaire s'intéresse ensuite à la question de la lecture, de l'écriture et de l'enseignement à Qumrân ainsi que dans le judaïsme contemporain de la période. Le nombre de copies de certains rouleaux découverts dans les grottes, invite A. Lemaire à supposer, d'une part, la pratique d'une lecture privée, méditée, plutôt que d'une lecture orale de type synagogale et, d'autre part, la connaissance de la lecture et de l'écriture de l'hébreu carré pour la plupart. Il propose, à la suite d'E. Tov, d'attribuer l'écriture paléo-hébraïque au courant sadducéen ou éventuellement samaritain (p. 67). Enfin, concernant l'enseignement, il assimile l'établissement de Qumrân à une sorte de *beit midrash* (p. 65) où la transmission et l'interprétation de la Torah seraient dispensées par les prêtres comme dans le courant sadducéen alors que dans le courant pharisien elle l'était par «de savants et notables laïcs» (p. 77).

Émile Puech propose une nouvelle synthèse sur les apports des manuscrits de Qumrân à notre connaissance de la croyance à la résurrection dans le judaïsme ancien. Après avoir rappelé les données scripturaires (Dn 12,1–3; Is 26,14.19), l'auteur passe en revue l'ensemble des textes attestant cette croyance dans les manuscrits de Qumrân: 4Q*Instruction*, le *Pseudo-Ézéchiel*, l'*Apocalypse messianique*, l'*Instruction sur les deux esprits* et des passages des *Hymnes*.

Michael Langlois recense les nouvelles sources textuelles disponibles pour l'établissement du texte du livre d'Énoch depuis la publication des fragments araméens par J. T. Milik. Ainsi en araméen: les fragments 2 à 8 de 4Q201, 4Q208, 4Q209 ainsi qu'un nouveau fragment inédit au moment de la rédaction de cet article, XQpapEnoch (voir maintenant E. et H. Eshel, «New Fragments from Qumran: 4QGen^f, 4QIsa^b, 4Q226, 8QGen, and XQpapEnoch», *DSD* 12 (2005), pp. 134–157); en grec: 7QHén gr (= 7Q4 1–2, 7Q8, 7Q11, 7Q14); en éthiopien: les manuscrits Kebran 9 (probablement le plus ancien et le plus proche des versions grecques et araméennes), Tanasee 9 et EMMML 2080. L'auteur montre ensuite, à partir de quelques exemples, l'intérêt de l'utilisation de l'outil informatique pour la lecture des fragments et pour la vérification de certaines restitutions (mais voir déjà A. Lange, *Computer Aided Text-Reconstruction and Transcription. CATT-Manual*, Tübingen, Mohr Siebeck, 1993).

Folker Siegert recherche les parallèles entre l'Évangile *authentique selon Jean* et les «Chants de sacrifice du Sabbat», tous deux étant des témoins de la mystique juive à l'époque du Second Temple. L'auteur se fonde pour cela sur sa reconstruction de la couche la plus ancienne de l'évangile de Jean (voir F. Siegert, *Der Erstentwurf des Johannes. Das ursprüngliche, judenchristliche Johannesevangelium in deutscher Übersetzung vorgestellt* (Münsteraner Judaistische Studien, 16), Münster, 2004). Mais la méthodologie de l'auteur n'est guère convaincante, outre le fait qu'il se fonde sur une version hypothétique de l'évangile de Jean, les citations et les traductions des *Širot 'olat haš-šabbat* sont souvent approximatives. L'auteur utilise vraisemblablement la *Study Edition* de Florentino García Martínez et Eibert Tigchelaar, mais il ne distingue plus ce qui relève de la reconstruction des auteurs de ce qui apparaît effectivement dans le manuscrit. En outre, l'auteur ne semble pas avoir consulté l'édition officielle de Carol Newsom dans les *Discoveries in the Judaean Desert* XI. Voici quelques exemples tirés des pages 134–135: en 4Q400 1 i 4, l'auteur lit et commente l'expression כול אלי דעת (p. 134), transcrit [דעת לכול אלי] dans la *Study Edition* et ן לכול אלי par C. Newsom. Le développement sur la *gnose* qui s'en suit repose ainsi sur une base hypothétique, même si la restauration est peut-être légitime. De même quelques lignes plus loin le syntagme כול רוחות אלוהים commenté par l'auteur, n'apparaît pas dans le manuscrit (C. Newsom transcrit juste אלוהים). En 4Q400 1 i 16 lire כול שבי פשע. La référence 4Q400 fr. 2, 1, 2 à la page 135 est incorrecte, lire 4Q400 fr. 2 ligne 7, etc. Les exemples se multiplient dans l'ensemble de l'étude (voir la citation de 4Q400 1 i 1ss p. 133) et nuisent ainsi à l'argumentation.

Dans le dernier article, Simon C. Mimouni propose un état de la question sur les liens entre Qumrân et les origines du christianisme accompagné d'une brève comparaison entre le messianisme essénien et le messianisme chrétien. On regrette que l'état de la question soit si bref, outre les polémiques qui n'ont pas reçu de véritables échos dans le monde scientifique, S. C. Mimouni ne présente que les points de vue de G. Vermes, J.T. Milik et A. Paul. La comparaison relative au messianisme est également trop approximative sans proposer une étude précise des textes abordés. Notons par exemple que 1QSa et 1QSB ne constituent pas des copies de 1QS (p. 146) et que l'exemple du commentaire d'Ha 2,4b dans le *Pesher d'Habaquq* et en Ga 3,11 ne semble pas être lié à la question du messianisme. L'ouvrage ne comporte pas d'index.

En conclusion, on notera que ce volume présente des contributions de qualités assez inégales, certaines s'apparentant à de la vulgarisation scientifique, d'autres apportant des éléments nouveaux à la recherche. Ces dernières pourraient ouvrir de nouvelles pistes de réflexion.

Jean Sébastien REY

ABATE, Emma, *La fine del regno di Sedecia* (Textos y Estudios "Cardenal Cisneros", 76; Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2008), 244 pp. ISBN: 8400086945.

This book presents a thorough text-critical analysis of the parallel passages 2Kgs 24:18-25:30//Jer 52, that relate the dramatic moments of the siege of Jerusalem in the last years of the kingdom of Judah.

The analysis is divided into ten chapters. Chapter 1 is a dense introductory note (pp.19-48) on the textual criticism of *Sam-Kgs* that provides the reader with a careful and up-to-date state of the question that goes further on the specific subject matter of the book examining also the material from the Judean desert. Chapter 2 is devoted to the study of the MT and LXX^b variant readings to be found in the 2Kgs passage (pp. 49-59), and chapter 3 to the lucianic variant readings in the same passage. The same pattern of variant analysis is applied to the *Jer* passage in the next two chapters. A detailed study of the Hebrew variant readings of both passages in the Medieval tradition is the focus of chapter 6, where the author has the merit of putting Kennicott's seminal though neglected collection to good use. Chapter 8 is devoted to the pre-lucianic layer of LXX 2Kgs 24:18-25:30//Jer 52, compared with the Peshitta, Josephus and the *Vetus latina* of Jer 52. Chapter 9, the last one of the first section of the book, is a sort of reappraisal of the data examined in the preceding chapters, which leads the author to the main conclusion that LXX *Jer* 52 is the most ancient textual form that it is possible to reconstruct. It is worth noting that this textual form is not attested in any extant witness but it is the presumed *Vorlage* of J. Ziegler's critical edition of LXX *Jeremiah*. In other words, the author dares to look for the *original* text of the whole narrative, which is, or should be, the ultimate end of any philologist's work.

In the second section of the book the author passes from lower to higher criticism and analyzes the parallel passages as a historical source. Thanks to the careful philological analysis of the preceding chapters she is able to conclude that the most ancient form of the narrative we read today in 2Kgs 24:18-25:30//Jer 52 originated at the very beginning of the Persian rule in Judah, when the redactors were still hoping for a restoration of the Davidic descent. Later on, this form was heavily reworked in a Zadokite *milieu* by adding among other things several details on Zedekiah's faults and sins for the sake of bringing discredit on the ruling dynasty.

The last chapter analyses the story from two broader points of view, namely the point of view of narratology, that is to say on the basis of the universal pattern of codes that operates within the text of a work. On these grounds, the author offers an intriguing, though brief, analysis of the analogies with the biblical story of Samson's death (*Jdg* 16:4-21) and of Saul's crowning (*ISam* 11). As for this latter episode, it is interesting to remark that

the author makes her point on the grounds of the *I Samuel* text as attested in *4QSam^a*. This way, she clearly takes sides on the vexed question of the antiquity of the *4QSam^a* textual tradition.

The next point of view is history of religions. Here the author presents a daring parallel, though again brief, analysis of Oedipus' and Zedekiah's characters as well as of their fate. The book ends with an extensive bibliography and regrettably has no indexes.

As far as I know, Biblical studies are the only field where we are faced with a number of statements, some of them influential and authoritative, against the need of a sound and clear-cut philological approach to the text of the Bible.

Books like the one under review are the best proof that the only way of shedding some light on ancient history is first and foremost a philological analysis of the sources at our disposal. Within a few years historians will be continuing to study this book and everybody will have forgotten fearful utterances against philology.

Corrado MARTONE

THE ORION CENTER BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS (January-December 2009)

by Ruth A. CLEMENTS, Nadav SHARON, and
Hannah WORTZMAN

- ADLER, William. "Moses, the Exodus, and Comparative Chronology." In *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, 47–65. NovTSup 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- ADLER, Yonatan. "Ritual Baths Adjacent to Tombs: An Analysis of the Archaeological Evidence in Light of the Halakhic Sources." *JSJ* 40/1 (2009) 55–73.
- AITKEN, James K. "Poet and Critic: Royal Ideology and the Greek Translator of Proverbs." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 190–204. *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- ALEXANDER, Philip S., and Loveday ALEXANDER. "The Image of the Oriental Monarch in the Third Book of Maccabees." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 92–109. *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- ANDERSEN, Francis I. "The Sun in 2 *Enoch*." In *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 1–38. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- ANDERSON, Gary A. "Towards a Theology of the Tabernacle and Its Furniture." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 161–194. *STDJ* 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- APPELBAUM, Alan. "'The Idumaeans' in Josephus' *The Jewish War*." *JSJ* 40/1 (2009) 1–22.

- ARIEL, Donald T., Hava KATZ, Shelley SADEH, and Michael SEGAL. *The Dead Sea Scrolls Catalogue*. Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority, 2007.
- ATKINSON, Kenneth, Hanan ESHEL, and Jodi MAGNESS. "Do Josephus's Writings Support the 'Essene Hypothesis'?" *BAR* 35 (2009) 56–59.
- ATTRIDGE, Harold W. "The Gospel of John and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 109–126. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- AUSLOOS, Hans, Bénédicte LEMMELIJN, and Marc VERVENNE, eds. *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*. BETL 224. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- AVEMARIE, Friedrich. "Interpreting Scripture through Scripture: Exegesis Based on Lexematic Association in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pauline Epistles." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 83–102. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- AVIOZ, Michael. "The Incineration of Saul's and His Sons' Corpses according to Josephus." *JSP* 18/4 (2009) 285–292.
- BADER, Mary Anna. *Tracing the Evidence: Dinah in Post-Hebrew Bible Literature*. Studies in Biblical Literature 102. New York: Peter Lang, 2008.
- BAKER, Cynthia M. "Whose 'Outer Limits'? Historiography for an Age of Destruction." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 104–113. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- BAR-ASHER, Moshe. "On the Language of the *Vision of Gabriel*." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 491–524.
- BAR-ASHER, Moshe. "Qumran Hebrew between Biblical and Mishnaic Hebrew: A Morphological Study." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 3–17. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- BAR-ASHER, Moshe. "על הלשון ב'חזון גבריאל' [On the Language of the *Vision of Gabriel*]." In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 193–226. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- BAR-ASHER, Moshe, and Devorah DIMANT, eds. *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*]. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- BARRICK, W. Boyd. *BMH as Body Language: A Lexical and Iconographical Study of the Word BMH When Not a Reference to Cultic Phenomena in Biblical and Post-Biblical Hebrew*. Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies 477. London: T&T Clark International, 2008.

- BARTON, John. *Oracles of God: Perceptions of Ancient Prophecy in Israel after the Exile*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007.
- BARZILAI, Gabriel. "חטאי דור המבול בפרשנות האגבית למקרא מקומראן" [Off-hand Exegesis in the Dead Sea Scrolls: The Generation of the Flood]." In *המקרא ועולמו, ספרות חז"ל ומשפט עברי ומחשבת ישראל* [*The Bible and its World, Rabbinic Literature and Jewish Law, and Jewish Thought*], ed. Baruch J. Schwartz, Abraham Melamed and Aharon Shemesh, 43–50. Iggud 1. Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 2008.
- BATSCH, Christophe. "Historie des Géants et de Noé (1Q19–19bis)"; "Commentaires sur la vie des patriarches (4Q464)." In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, 1. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 249–255; 389–397. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- BAUCKHAM, Richard. "The Horarium of Adam and the Chronology of the Passion." In *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 39–68. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- BAUCKHAM, Richard. *The Jewish World around the New Testament: Collected Essays I*. WUNT 223. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- BAUMGARTEN, Albert I. "Elias Bickerman on the Hellenizing Reformers: A Case Study of an Unconvincing Case." *JQR* 97/2 (2007) 149–179.
- BAUMGARTEN, Albert I. "Pharisaic Authority: Prophecy and Power (*Antiquities* 17.41–45)." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 81–96. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- BAUMGARTEN, Albert I. "Setting the Outer Limits: Temple Policy in the Centuries Prior to Destruction." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 88–103. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph M. "A Proposed Re-interpretation of Qumran Shabbat Regulations." In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלואות לו שנים עשר וחמש שנה* [*Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, *9–*13. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- BAUMGARTEN, Joseph M. "מסורות 'הלכתיות' קדומות במגילות ים המלח" [Common Legal Exegesis in the Scrolls and Tannaitic Sources]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:649–665. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- BAUTCH, Kelley Coblentz. "Putting Angels in their Place: Developments in Second Temple Angelology." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 174–188. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- BAUTCH, Richard J. *Glory and Power, Ritual and Relationship: The Sinai Covenant in the Postexilic Period*. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.

- BECKWITH, Roger T. "The Significance of the 364-Day Calendar for the Old Testament Canon." In *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 69–81. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- BEDENBENDER, Andreas. "The Book of Jubilees: An Example of 'Rewritten Torah'?" *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 72–78.
- BEDENBENDER, Andreas. "Seers as Mantic Sages in Jewish Apocalyptic (Daniel and Enoch)." In *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, 258–270. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- BEENTJES, Pancratius C. "'Full Wisdom is from the Lord': Sir 1:1–10 and its Place in Israel's Wisdom Literature." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 139–154. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- BEENTJES, Pancratius C. "Portrayals of David in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 165–182. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- BEGG, Christopher T. "Israel's Confrontation with Edom (Num 20,14–21) According to Josephus and Philo." *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 32/1 (2007) 1–18.
- BEGG, Christopher T. "Two Ancient Rewritings of Numbers 11." *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 32/2 (2007) 299–317.
- BEKKUM, Wout Jacques van. "Qumran Hymnology and Piyyut: Contrast and Comparison." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 341–356.
- BELLIA, Giuseppe. "An Historico-Anthropological Reading of the Work of Ben Sira." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 49–78. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- BEN-DOV, Jonathan. "Tradition and Innovation in the Calendar of Jubilees." In *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*, ed. Gabriele Boccaccini and Giovanni Ibba, 276–293. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- BEN-DOV, Jonathan. "הכתיבה בארמית ובעברית במגילות קומראן ובספרים: הרקע בעולם העתיק והחיפוש אחר סמכות יהודית כתובה [Hebrew and Aramaic Writing in the Pseudepigrapha and the Qumran Scrolls: The Ancient Near Eastern Background and the Quest for a Written Authority]." *Tarbiz* 78/1 (2009) 27–60.
- BEN-DOV, Jonathan. "השנה בת 364 יום בקומראן ובספרות החיצונית" [The 364-day Year in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha]. In *מגילות ומחקרים: קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:435–476. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- BEN-DOV, Jonathan. "עיונים בחגי ראש השנה בבבל ובירושלם" [Studies on the New Year Festivals in Babylonia and Israel]. *Shnaton: An Annual for Biblical and Ancient Near Eastern Studies* 18 (2008) 249–267.

- BEN-TOR, Amnon. בחזרה למצדה [Back to Masada]. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben Zvi and Israel Antiquities Authority, 2009.
- BEN-YEHOSHUA, Shimshon, and Baruch ROZEN. "הסוד של עין-גדי" [The Secret of Ein-Gedi]. *Cathedra* 132 (2009) 77–100.
- BERNER, Christoph. "Jubilees and Beyond? Some Observations on the Chronological Structure of the Book of Jubilees 50." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 17–23.
- BERTHELOT, Katell. "Zeal for God and Divine Law in Philo and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Studia Philonica Annual* 19 (2007) 113–129.
- BERTHELOT, Katell, Thierry LEGRAND, and André PAUL, eds. *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, 1. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- BHAYRO, Siam. "A Leaf from a Medieval Hebrew Book of Tobit: Jacques Mosseri Genizah Collection at Cambridge University Library, Mosseri I.38 (with a note on the dating of T-S A45.25)." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 163–173. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- BHAYRO, Siam. "The Use of Jubilees in Medieval Chronicles to Supplement Enoch: The Case for the 'Shorter' Reading." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 10–17.
- BILDE, Per. "Filon som polemiker og politisk apologet." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 155–179. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- BILDE, Per. "Mod Apion—en nøgle til Josefus' forfatterskab?" In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 283–318. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- BIRENBOIM, Hannan. "'The Place Which the Lord Shall Choose,' the 'Temple City' and the 'Camp' in 11QT^a." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 357–369.
- BIRENBOIM, Hannan. "Tevul Yom and the Red Heifer: Pharisaic and Sadducean Halakah." *DSD* 16/2 (2009) 254–273.
- BIRENBOIM, Hannan. "מעמדה ההלכתי של ירושלים על פי מגילת מקצת מעשי" (התורה 4Q399–4Q394), חזון החיות (חנוך החבשי פה-צ) וספרות התנאים [The Halakhic Status of Jerusalem According to 4QMMT, 1 Enoch, and Tannaitic Literature]. In מגילות מדבר יהודה ז [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 3–17. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- BLENKINSOPP, Joseph. *Judaism, the First Phase: The Place of Ezra and Nehemiah in the Origins of Judaism*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- BLISCHKE, Mareike Verena. *Die Eschatologie der Sapientia Salomonis. Forschungen zum Alten Testament* 26. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- BOCCACCINI, Gabriele, and Giovanni IBBA, eds. *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

- BOCKMUEHL, Markus. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of Biblical Commentary." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 3–29. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- BOHAK, Gideon. *Ancient Jewish Magic: A History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- BOHAK, Gideon. "Prolegomena to the Study of the Jewish Magical Tradition." *Currents in Biblical Research* 8/1 (2009) 107–150.
- BORGONOVO, Gianantonio. "Jubilees' Rapprochement between Henochic and Mosaic Tradition." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 29–35.
- BORMANN, Lukas. "Jüdische oder römische Perspektive? Neue Studien zum römisch dominierten Judäa—Ein kritischer Literaturbericht." *Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte* 61/2 (2009) 105–123.
- BÖTTTRICH, Christfried. "Biblische Figuren im slavischen Henoch-Buch." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 303–336. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- BOUSTAN, Ra'anan S., Alex P. JASSEN, and Calvin J. ROETZEL. "Violence, Scripture, and Textual Practices in Early Judaism and Christianity." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 17/1–2 (2009) 1–11.
- BOYD-TAYLOR, Cameron. "An Ear for an Eye: Lay Literacy and the Septuagint." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 127–145. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- BROOKE, George J. "From Bible to Midrash: Approaches to Biblical Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls by Modern Interpreters." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnings and Martin Ehrensverd, 1–19. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- BROOKE, George J. "Moving Mountains: From Sinai to Jerusalem." In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 73–89. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- BROOKE, George J. "New Perspectives on the Bible and its Interpretation in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 19–37. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- BROOKE, George J. "The Place of Prophecy in Coming Out of Exile: The Case of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 535–550. Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- BROOKE, George J. "The Pre-sectarian Jesus." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 33–48. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- BROOKE, George J. "Prophets and Prophecy in the Qumran Scrolls and the New Testament." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 31–48. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- BROOKE, George J. "Peshet and Midrash in Qumran Literature: Issues for Lexicography." *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 75–95.
- BROSHI, Magen. "Eight Critical Junctures in Ancient Jewish History." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 15–22. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- BROSHI, Magen. "אורחות חיים בקומראן [Daily Life at Qumran]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:25–48. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- CALDUCH-BENAGES, Núria. "The Hymn to the Creation (Sir 42:15–43:33): A Polemic Text?" In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 119–138. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- CALDUCH-BENAGES, Núria. "Jerusalem as Widow (Baruch 4:5–5:9)." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 147–164. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- CARGILL, Robert. *Qumran through (Real) Time: A Virtual Reconstruction of Qumran and the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Bible in Technology 1. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- CARMICHAEL, Calum M. "Law and Narrative in Jubilees: The Biblical Precedent." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 78–83.
- CHARLES, Ronald. "Hybridity and the Letter of Aristeas." *JSJ* 40/2 (2009) 242–259.
- CHARLES, Ronald. "A Postcolonial Reading of Joseph and Aseneth." *JSP* 18/4 (2009).
- CHARLESWORTH, James H. "The Temple, Purity, and the Background to Jesus' Death." *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 33/2 (2008) 395–442.
- CHARLESWORTH, James H. "Writings Ostensibly Outside the Canon." In *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, 57–85. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- CHILTON, Bruce. "Paul and the Pharisees." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 149–173. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.

- CHRISTIANSEN, Ellen Juhl. "Artapanos—en tidlig jødisk apologet." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 97–113. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- CLEMENTS, Ruth A., and Daniel R. SCHWARTZ, eds. *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- CLEMENTS, Ruth A., and Nadav SHARON. "The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (January–June 2007)." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 575–602.
- CLEMENTS, Ruth A., and Nadav SHARON. "The Orion Center Bibliography of the Dead Sea Scrolls (July–December 2007)." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 431–456.
- CLINES, David J. A., ed. *Concise Dictionary of Classical Hebrew*. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- COHEN, Shaye J. D. "Common Judaism in Greek and Latin Authors." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 69–87. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- COHN, Yehudah B. *Tangled Up in Text: Tefillin and the Ancient World*. Brown Judaic Studies 351. Providence, R.I.: Brown Judaic Studies, 2008.
- COLLINS, Adela Yarbro, and John J. COLLINS. *King and Messiah as Son of God: Divine, Human, and Angelic Messianic Figures in Biblical and Related Literature*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- COLLINS, John J. *Beyond the Qumran Community: The Sectarian Movement of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- COLLINS, John J. "The Idea of Election in 4 Ezra." *Jewish Studies Quarterly* 16/1 (2009) 83–96.
- COLLINS, John J. "In memoriam John Strugnell." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 309–311.
- COLLINS, John J. "The Interpretation of Psalm 2." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 49–66. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- COLLINS, John J. "The Sons of God and the Daughters of Men." In *Sacred Marriages: The Divine–Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity*, ed. Martti Nissinen and Risto Uro, 259–274. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- COLLINS, Matthew A. *The Use of Sobriquets in the Qumran Dead Sea Scrolls*. Library of Second Temple Studies 67. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.

- CORLEY, Jeremy. "The Portrait of Samuel in Hebrew Ben Sira 46:13–20." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 31–56. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- CORLEY, Jeremy. "Searching for Structure and Redaction in Ben Sira: An Investigation of Beginnings and Endings." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 21–48. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- CRAWFORD, Sidnie White, and Christopher A. HOFFMANN. "A Note on 4Q365, Frag. 23 and *Nehemiah* 10:33–36." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 429–430.
- CROY, N. Clayton. "Disrespecting Dionysus: 3 Maccabees as Narrative Satire of the God of Wine." In *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, 3–19. Novum Testamentum, Supplements 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- DAISE, Michael A. "The Temple Scroll's Calendar: Revisiting the Feast of Oil in the Calendrical Documents/ 'Mišmarot'." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 329–338. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- DAVID, Nora. "The Terminology of Death at Qumran." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 339–348. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- DAVILA, James R. "Ritual in the Old Testament Apocrypha." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 123–145. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- DE TROYER, Kristin. "When Did the Pentateuch Come into Existence? An Uncomfortable Perspective." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 269–286. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- DEBEL, Hans. "'The Lord Looks at the Heart' (1 Sam 16:7): 11QPs^a 151 A–B as a 'Variant Literary Edition' of Ps 151 LXX." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 459–473.
- DEMPSTER, Stephen G. "Torah, Torah, Torah: The Emergence of the Tripartite Canon." In *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, 87–127. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- DENNILL, G. B. "A Comparison of the Qumran Community and Hare Krishna Movement Regarding Ritual Impurity, Its Sources and Rectification." *Journal for Semitics* 18/1 (2009) 15–33.

- DESCAMP, Mary Therese. *Metaphor and Ideology: Liber Antiquitatum Biblicarum and Literary Methods through a Cognitive Lens*. Biblical Interpretation Series 87. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- DI LELLA, Alexander A. "Ben Sira's Doctrine on the Discipline of the Tongue: An Intertextual and Synchronic Analysis." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia, 233–252. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- DI LELLA, Alexander A. "Tobit 4,19 and Romans 9,18: An Intertextual Study." *Biblica* 90/2 (2009) 260–263.
- DÍEZ MERINO, Luis. "El cordero de Dios en la literatura intertestamental." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 551–568. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- DIHI, Haim. "על שורשים ונטעים ארמיים מקוריים שתיעודם הראשון בעברית בספר" [Aramaic Verbal Roots and Primary Nouns Initially Attested in the Hebrew Book of Ben Sira]. In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 89–116. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "The Book of Tobit and the Qumran Halakhah." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 121–143. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "The Family of Tobit." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 157–162. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "Sectarian and Non-Sectarian Texts from Qumran: The Pertinence and Usage of Taxonomy." *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 7–18.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "בין כתבים כתתיים לכתבים לא כתתיים במגילות קומראן" [Criteria for the Identification of Qumran Sectarian Texts]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:49–86. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "המצע המקראי של תוספות שאינן מן המקרא: עקדת יצחק" [The Biblical Basis of Non-Biblical Additions: The Sacrifice of Isaac in Light of the Story of Job]. In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלואות לו ששים וחמש שנה* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 117–140. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- DIMANT, Devorah. "עת עת ופשריה—עקרון פרשנות התלויה בזמן בפשרים" [Time-Dependent Exegesis in the Qumranic Pesharim]. In *מקומראן* [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 19–41. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.

- DIMANT, Devorah, and Reinhard G. KRATZ, eds. *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*. Forschungen zum Alten Testament 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- DINES, Jennifer. "The King's Good Servant? Loyalty, Subversion, and Greek Daniel." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 205–224. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- DOBOS, Károly Daniel. "The Consolation of History: A Reexamination of the Chronology of the Abraham Pericope in the Book of Jubilees." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 84–91.
- DOBOS, Károly Daniel, and Miklós KÖSZEGHY, eds. *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*. Hebrew Bible Monographs 21. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- DOCHHORN, Jan. "Die Christologie in Hebr 1,1–2,9 und die Weltherrschaft Adams in Vit Ad 11–17." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 281–302. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- DOERING, Lutz. "Marriage and Creation in Mark 10 and CD 4–5." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 133–163. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- DRAWNEL, Henryk. "Some Notes on Scribal Craft and the Origins of the Enochic Literature." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 66–72.
- DUBS, Jean-Claude. "4Q321 ou le calendrier bien tempéré." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 88/4 (2008) 417–450.
- DUBS, Jean-Claude. "Deux manuscrits calendaires de Qoumrân: Le calendrier des Signes célestes (4Q319) et le Registre annuel des Temps sacrés (4Q394a)." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 89/1 (2009) 29–50.
- DUBS, Jean-Claude. "Prière d'Enosh (4Q369)." In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, I. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 7–11. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- ECKHARDT, Benedikt. "PsSal 17, die Hasmonaer und der Herodompeius." *JSJ* 40/4–5 (2009) 465–492.
- ECKHARDT, Benedikt. "Reclaiming Tradition: The Book of Judith and Hasmonaean Politics." *JSP* 18/4 (2009) 243–263.
- EDWARDS, Douglas R. "Constructing Kings—From the Ptolemies to the Herodians: The Archaeological Evidence." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 283–293. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- EGGER-WENZEL, Renate. "Mirjam, Debora und Judit: Eine Prophetinnen-tradition?" In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 95–122. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- EGO, Beate. "Abraham's Faith in the One God—A Motif of the Image of Abraham in Early Jewish Literature." In *Biblical Figures in Deutero-*

- 'Year Four of the Destruction of the House of Israel' in Which a Widow Declared that She Received All Her Rights?'" *Cathedra* 132 (2009) 5–24.
- ESHEL, Hanan. "A Note on 11QPs^d Fragment 1." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 529–531.
- ESHEL, Hanan. "The Two Historical Layers of *Pesher Habakkuk*." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensward, 107–117. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- ESHEL, Hanan. "ההיסטוריה של עדת קומראן וההיבט ההיסטורי של ספרות הפשרים" [The History of the Qumran Community and Historical Aspects of the *Pesharim*]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:191–207. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- ESHEL, Hanan. "מזמורים שאינם בנוסח המסורה המתועדים במגילות ספר תהלים" [Non-Canonical Psalms from Qumran]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:209–224. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- ESHEL, Hanan. "תולדות התגליות הארכאולוגיות בקומראן" [The History of the Discoveries at Qumran]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:3–24. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- ESHEL, Hanan, and Shlomit KENDI-HAREL. "שיר אלה-ביתי מימי" [Psalm 155: A Hymn about Repentance]." In *מזמור קנה: שיר אלה-ביתי מימי* [Psalm 155: A Hymn about Repentance]. In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלאת לו שישים וחמש שנה* [*Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 29–51. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- EVANS, Craig A., and Emanuel Tov, eds. *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- FALK, Daniel K. "Anatomy of a Scene: Noah's Covenant in *Genesis Apocryphon XI*." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensward, 21–39. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- FALK, Daniel K. "Dating the Watchers: What's at Stake?" *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 23–29.
- FASSBERG, Steven E. "'Son' in Aramaic." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:361–370. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.

- FEDER, Yitzhak. "איסור תפילה לטמאים בקומראן? [Was Prayer Prohibited to the Impure at Qumran?]." In מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 145–155. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- FELDMAN, Ariel. "4Q464^a על הקטע [A Note on 4Q464^a]." In מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 299–304. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- FELDMAN, Ariel. "The Story of the Flood in 4Q422." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 57–77. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- FELDMAN, Louis H. "Josephus' View of the Amalekites." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 89–115. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- FELDMAN, Louis H. "Philo's Interpretation of Korah." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 55–70. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- FIENSY, David A. *Jesus the Galilean: Soundings in a First Century Life*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2007.
- FISK, Bruce N. "Pseudo-Philo, Paul and Israel's Rolling Stone: Early Points Along an Exegetical Trajectory." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 117–136. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- FITZMYER, Joseph A. *A Guide to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature*. Revised and Expanded ed. Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- FLINT, Peter W. "11QPs^b and the 11QPs^a-Psalter." In *Diachronic and Synchronic: Reading the Psalms in Real Time. Proceedings of the Baylor Symposium on the Book of Psalms*, ed. Joel S. Burnett, W. H. Bellinger Jr. and W. Dennis Tucker Jr., 157–166. New York: T&T Clark, 2007.
- FLINT, Peter W., and Nathaniel N. DYKSTRA. "Newly Identified Fragments of 1QIsa^b." *JJS* 60/1 (2009) 80–89.
- FLINT, Peter W., and Eugene ULRICH. "The Variant Textual Readings in the Hebrew University Isaiah Scroll (1QIsa^b)." *JJS* 60/1 (2009) 60–79.
- FRANCISCO, Edson de Faria. "A ortografia de 1QIsA e de 1QIsB e a ortografia do códice de Leningrado B19A e do códice de Alepo: diferenças e semelhanças [The Orthography of 1QIsA and 1QIsB and the Orthography of the Leningrad Codex B19A and the Aleppo Codex: Differences and Similarities]." *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos* 57 (2008) 125–148.
- FREEDMAN, David Noel, and Joshua J. VAN EE. "Scribal Interventions in 1QIsaiah^a." In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Chaim Cohen and

- Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, 2:787-799. 2 vols. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- FREUND, Richard A. "How the Dead Sea Scrolls Influenced Reform Judaism." *American Jewish Archives Journal* 61/1 (2009) 115-143.
- FREY, Jörg. "Recent Perspectives on Johannine Dualism and Its Background." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11-13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 127-157. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- FREYNE, Seán. "Apocalyptic, Wisdom and the Historical Jesus Debate." *Revista Catalana de Teologia* 33/2 (2008) 461-475.
- FUGLSETH, Kåre Sigvald. "Filons forhold til tempelet i Jerusalem i eit apologetisk perspektiv." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 263-282. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino, ed. *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino. "Qumran Between the Old and the New Testament." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 1-6. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino. "¿Sectario, no-sectario, o qué? Problemas de una taxonomía correcta de los textos qumránicos." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 383-394.
- GARCÍA MARTÍNEZ, Florentino, and Eibert J. C. TIGCHELAAR, eds. *사해문서 [The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition (1997-1998)]*. 4 vols. Seoul: Nanam, 2009.
- GARDNER, Gregg, and Kevin OSTERLOH, eds. *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*. Texts and Studies in Ancient Judaism 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- GILBERT, Maurice. "Methodological and Hermeneutical Trends in Modern Exegesis on the Book of Ben Sira." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 1-20. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- GLADD, Benjamin L. *Revealing the Mysterion: The Use of Mystery in Daniel and Second Temple Judaism with Its Bearing on First Corinthians*. BZNT 160. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- GOFF, Matthew J. "Gilgamesh the Giant: The Qumran Book of Giants' Appropriation of Gilgamesh Motifs." *DSD* 16/2 (2009) 221-253.
- GOFF, Matthew J. "Recent Trends in the Study of Early Jewish Wisdom Literature: The Contribution of 4QInstruction and Other Qumran Texts." *Currents in Biblical Research* 7/3 (2009) 376-416.
- GOLB, Norman. "Observations on the Bipolar Theory of So-Called 'Qumran Spellings'." http://oi.uchicago.edu/pdf/bipolar_theory.pdf. Chicago: The Oriental Institute, 2009.

- GOLDMAN, Liora. "The Exegesis and Structure of Pesharim in the Damascus Document." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 193–202. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- GOODBLATT, David. "Dating Documents in Herodian Judaea." In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Held at the IJS Conference, 21st–23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 127–154. IJS Studies in Judaica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- GOODMAN, Martin. "The Place of the Sadducees in First-Century Judaism." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 139–152. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- GOODMAN, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. London: Penguin, 2008.
- GRABBE, Lester L. *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period, Volume 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175)*. London: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- GRABBE, Lester L. "Jewish Identity and Hellenism in the Fragmentary Jewish Writings in Greek." In *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O'Day, 21–32. Novum Testamentum, Supplements 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- GRABBE, Lester L. "The Terminology of Government in the Septuagint—In Comparison with Hebrew, Aramaic, and Other Languages." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 225–237. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- GREEN, William Scott. "What Do We Really Know about the Pharisees, and How Do We Know It?" In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 409–423. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- GROSSMAN, Maxine L. "Affective Masculinity: The Gender of the Patriarchs in Jubilees." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 91–97.
- GRUEN, Erich S. "The Letter of Aristaeas and the Cultural Context of the Septuagint." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 134–156. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- GRUEN, William III. "Seeking a Context for the Testament of Job." *JSP* 18/3 (2009) 163–179.
- GUILLAUME, Philippe. "A Reconsideration of Manuscripts Classified as Scrolls of the Twelve Minor Prophets (XII)." *JHS* 7/16 (2007) http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_77.pdf.
- GUSELLA, Laura. "Il deserto dei Terapeuti a confronto con quello di Esseni e Qumranici." *Adamantius* 14 (2008) 52–66.

- GUSSMANN, Oliver. *Das Priesterverständnis des Flavius Josephus* [Flavius Josephus' Understanding of the Priesthood]. TSAJ 124. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- GZELLA, Holger. "Dating the Aramaic Texts from Qumran: Possibilities and Limits." *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 61–78.
- HAALAND, Gunnar. "A Villain and the VIPs: Josephus on Judas the Galilean and the Essenes." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensärd, 237–249. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- HABER, Susan. "Common Judaism, Common Synagogue? Purity, Holiness, and Sacred Space at the Turn of the Common Era." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 63–77. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- HAHNE, Harry Alan. *The Corruption and Redemption of Creation: Nature in Romans 8.19–22 and Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*. Library of New Testament Studies 336. London: T&T Clark, 2006.
- HAKOLA, Raimo. "Social Identities and Group Phenomena in Second Temple Judaism." In *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*, ed. Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen and Risto Uro, 259–276. Biblical Interpretation Series 89. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- HAKOLA, Raimo, and Adele REINHARTZ. "John's Pharisees." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 131–147. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- HAMIDOVIĆ, David. "La Halakhah chez les Esséniens et son rôle dans la question messianique." *Revue des études juives* 167/3–4 (2008) 345–365.
- HAMITOVSKY, Itzhak. "הפולמוס היהודי-שומרוני על תחום היישוב השומרוני בתקופות ההלניסטית והחשמונאית לאור מגילות קומראן והספרות החיצונית [The Jewish-Samaritan Territorial Controversy during the Hellenistic and Hasmonean Periods as Reflected in the Qumran Scrolls and the Pseudepigrapha]." In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 43–70. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- HANNAH, Darrell D. "The Virgin Heifer and a Lost Christian Version of the 'Animal Apocalypse'." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 222–238. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- HARAN, Menachem. *האסופה המקראית: תהליכי הגיבוש עד סוף ימי בית שני ושינויי הצורה עד מוצאי ימי הביניים* [The Biblical Collection: Its Consolidation to the End of the Second Temple Times and Changes of Form to the End of the Middle Ages]. Jerusalem: The Hebrew University Magnes Press, 2008.
- HARRINGTON, Hannah. "What is the Semantic Field of the Lexemes טהר and טמא in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 97–114.

- HEMPEL, Charlotte. "Do the Scrolls Suggest Rivalry Between the Sons of Aaron and the Sons of Zadok and If So Was It Mutual?" *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 135–193.
- HEMPEL, Charlotte. "Texts, Scribes and Scholars: Reflections on a Busy Decade in Dead Sea Scrolls Research." *The Expository Times* 120 (2009) 272–276.
- HENTEN, Jan Willem van. "Royal Ideology: 1 and 2 Maccabees and Egypt." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 265–282. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- HENZE, Matthias. "Torah and Eschatology in the Syriac Apocalypse of Baruch." In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 201–215. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- HERR, Bertram. "Der Standpunkt des Epitomators, Perspektivenwechsel in der Forschung am Zweiten Makkabäerbuch." *Biblica* 90/1 (2009) 1–31.
- HERSHKOVITZ, Malka. "Herodian Pottery." In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Held at the IJS Conference, 21st–23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 267–278. IJS Studies in Judaica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- HIEBERT, Robert J. V. "4 Maccabees 18,6–19: Original Text or Secondary Interpolation?" In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 439–449. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- HIEBERT, Robert J. V. "The Greek Pentateuch and 4 Maccabees." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 239–254. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- HIMMELFARB, Martha. "Judaism in Antiquity: Ethno-Religion or National Identity (Review: Shaye J. D. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 2nd edition; and David Goodblatt, *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism*)." *JQR* 99/1 (2009) 65–73.
- HØGENHAVEN, Jesper. "Geography and Ideology in the Copper Scroll (3Q15) from Qumran." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensverd, 83–106. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- HOGETERP, Albert L. A. "Belief in Resurrection and its Religious Settings in Qumran and the New Testament." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 299–320. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- HOGETERP, Albert L. A. *Expectations of the End: A Comparative Tradition-Historical Study of Eschatological, Apocalyptic and Messianic Ideas in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament*. STDJ 83. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- HOGETERP, Albert L. A. "The Mystery of Israel's Salvation: A Re-Reading of Romans 11:25–32 in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 653–666. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- HOGETERP, Albert L. A. "Resurrection and Biblical Tradition: Pseudo-Ezekiel Reconsidered." *Biblica* 89/1 (2008) 59–69.
- HOLTZ, Gudrun. "Inclusivism at Qumran." *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 22–54.
- HONIGMAN, Sylvie. "The Narrative Function of the King and the Library in the *Letter of Aristeas*." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 128–146. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- HOPKINS, Jamal-Dominique. "The Authoritative Status of *Jubilees* at Qumran." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 97–104.
- HOPKINS, Jamal-Dominique. "Hebrew Patriarchs in the Book of *Jubilees*: A Descriptive Analysis as an Interpretative Methodology." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 239–252. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- HULTGREN, Stephen. "4Q521 and Luke's *Magnificat* and *Benedictus*." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 119–132. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- HULTGREN, Stephen. "4Q521, the Second Benediction of the *Tefilla*, the *Häsidim*, and the Development of Royal Messianism." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 313–340.
- IBBA, Giovanni. "The Evil Spirits in *Jubilees* and the Spirit of the Bastards in 4Q510 with Some Remarks on other Qumran Manuscripts." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 111–116.
- JACKSON, Bernard S. *Essays on Halakhah in the New Testament*. Jewish and Christian Perspectives Series 16. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- JACOBSON, David M., and Nikos KOKKINOS, eds. *Herod and Augustus: Papers Held at the IJS Conference, 21st–23rd June 2005*. IJS Studies in Judaica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- JACOBUS, Helen R. "The Curse of Cainan (*Jub.* 8.1–5): Genealogies in Genesis 5 and Genesis 11 and a Mathematical Pattern." *JSP* 18/3 (2009) 207–232.
- JANOWSKI, Bernd. "Gottes Weisheit in Jerusalem: Sirach 24 und die biblische Schekina-Theologie." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 1–30. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- JASSEN, Alex P. "The Dead Sea Scrolls and Violence: Sectarian Formation and Eschatological Imagination." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 17/1–2 (2009) 12–44.
- JOKIRANTA, Jutta M. "A Brotherhood at Qumran? Metaphorical Familial Language in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea*

- Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensärd, 173–203. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- JOKIRANTA, Jutta M. “Learning from Sectarian Responses: Windows on Qumran Sects and Emerging Christian Sects.” In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 177–209. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- JOKIRANTA, Jutta M. “Social Identity in the Qumran Movement: The Case of the Penal Code.” In *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*, ed. Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen and Risto Uro, 277–298. Biblical Interpretation Series 89. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- JONES, Ivor H. “The Finale of the Wisdom of Solomon: Its Context, Translation and Significance.” *JSP* 19/1 (2009) 3–43.
- JOOSTEN, Jan. “The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Septuagint in Mutual Illumination.” In *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, 245–252. BETL 224. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- JOOSTEN, Jan. “The Interpretation of Deuteronomy 29:17–18 in the Hellenistic Period: Septuagint, Qumran and Parabiblical Literature.” In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 107–120. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- JOOSTEN, Jan. “The Syntax of Volitive Verbal Forms in Qoheleth in Historical Perspective.” In *The Language of Qohelet in Its Context: Essays in Honour of Prof. A. Schoors on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. A. Berlejung and P. van Hecke, 47–60. OLA 164. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- JOYCE, Paul M. “Ezekiel 40–42: The Earliest ‘Heavenly Ascent’ Narrative?” In *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence*, ed. Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, 17–41. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007.
- JUCCI, Elio. “Il testo biblico e i manoscritti del Mar Morto.” In *La Bibbia: Testo di fede e modello letterario*, ed. Andrea Baccanini, Giovanni Frulla, Simone Mandolini and Stefano Perini, 29–48. Padova: Vincenzo Grasso, 2009.
- JUCCI, Elio. “L’ambiente di Gesù e le correnti messianiche intratestamentarie.” In *Il volto di Cristo: Via verità e Vita. Atti del Convegno Diocesano. Marina di Sibari (Cosenza), 26–27 settembre 2008*, ed. Diocesi di Cassano all’Ionio, 93–129. Gorle: Editrice Velar, 2008.
- KAISER, Otto. “Die eschatologische Prophetie im Danielbuch bei Flavius Josephus: Ein Beitrag zum Verständnis des Josephus.” In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 441–470. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- KALMAN, Jason. “Optimistic, Even With the Negatives: HUC-JIR and the Dead Sea Scrolls, 1948–1993.” *American Jewish Archives Journal* 61/1 (2009) 1–114.

- KARRER, Martin, and Wolfgang KRAUS, eds. *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- KARTVEIT, Magnar. "Who are the 'Fools' in 4QNarrative and Poetic Composition?" In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensverd, 119–133. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- KATZOFF, Ranon. "P. Yadin 21 and Rabbinic Law on Widows' Rights." *JQR* 97/4 (2007) 545–575.
- KETOLA, Kimmo. "A Cognitive Approach to Ritual Systems in First-Century Judaism." In *Explaining Christian Origins and Early Judaism: Contributions from Cognitive and Social Science*, ed. Petri Luomanen, Ilkka Pyysiäinen and Risto Uro, 96–114. Biblical Interpretation Series 89. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- KIM, Heerak Christian. *The Jerusalem Tradition in the Late Second Temple Period: Diachronic and Synchronic Developments Surrounding Psalms of Solomon 11*. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2007.
- KIM, Jong-Hoon. "Zur Textgeschichte von Sam-Kön anhand 2Kgt [Sam] 15,1–19,9." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 353–368. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- KISTER, Menahem. "Divorce, Reproof, and Other Sayings in the Synoptic Gospels: Jesus Traditions in the Context of 'Qumranic' and Other Texts." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 195–229. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem. "'In Adam': 1 Cor 15:21–22, 12:27 in Their Jewish Setting." In *Flores Florentino: Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Early Jewish Studies in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Anthony Hilhorst, Émile Puech and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar, 685–690. JSJSup 122. Leiden: Brill, 2007.
- KISTER, Menahem. "בין טקסטים מקומראן לטקסטים נוצריים קדומים" [Texts from Qumran and Early Christian Literature]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:629–648. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem. "ירושלים והמקדש בקומראן" [Jerusalem and the Temple in the Writings from Qumran]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:477–496. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.

- KISTER, Menahem. "ספרות החכמה בקומראן" [Wisdom Literature at Qumran]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:299–319. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem. "עוד על בעית זיהוי של כתבים כתתיים בקומראן" [Some Further Thoughts on Identifying Sectarian Writings at Qumran]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:87–90. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem. "על הרע ועל הטוב: הבסיס התאולוגי של עדת קומראן" [On Good and Evil: The Theological Foundations of the Qumran Community]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:497–528. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem. "קווים לאוצר המילים של כתבי קומראן" [Some Lexical Features of the Writings from Qumran]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:561–569. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KISTER, Menahem, ed. מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World]. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KLEIN, Anja. "From the 'Right Spirit' to the 'Spirit of Truth': Observations on Psalm 51 and 1QS." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 171–191. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- KNIBB, Michael A. *Essays on the Book of Enoch and Other Early Jewish Texts and Traditions*. SVTP 22. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- KNOHL, Israel. "Melchizedek: A Model for the Union of Kingship and Priesthood in the Hebrew Bible, 11QMelchizedek, and the Epistle to the Hebrews." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 255–266. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- KNOHL, Israel. *Messiahs and Resurrection in 'The Gabriel Revelation'*. Library of Judaic Studies 6. London: T&T Clark International, 2009.
- KNOHL, Israel. "The Suffering Servant: From Isaiah to the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Scriptural Exegesis—The Shapes of Culture and the Religious Imagination: Essays in Honour of Michael Fishbane*, ed. Deborah A. Green and Laura S. Lieber, 89–104. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- KNOHL, Israel. "שכתובים למקרא במגילות קומראן: מגילת המקדש ופרפרוזות לתורה" [The Bible Reworked at Qumran: The Temple Scroll and 4QReworked Pentateuch]." In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:157–168. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.

- KOHN, Risa Levitt, and Rebecca MOORE. *A Portable God: The Origin of Judaism and Christianity*. Lanham, Md. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 2007.
- KOLARCIK, Michael. "The Sage behind the Wisdom of Solomon." In *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, 245–259. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- KOOIJ, Arie van der. "The Greek Bible and Jewish Concepts of Royal Priesthood and Priestly Monarchy." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 255–264. *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- KOOIJ, Arie van der. "The Promulgation of the Pentateuch in Greek according to the *Letter of Aristaeus*." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voilila and Jutta Jokiranta, 179–191. *JSJSup* 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- KOOIJ, Arie van der. "The Septuagint of Isaiah and the Mode of Reading Prophecies in Early Judaism: Some Comments on LXX Isaiah 8–9." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 597–611. *WUNT* 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- KOTTSIEPER, Ingo. "The Aramaic Tradition: Ahikar." In *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, 109–124. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- KOTTSIEPER, Ingo. "'Look, Son, What Nadab Did to Ahikaros.' The Aramaic Ahikar Tradition and its Relationship to the Book of Tobit." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 145–167. *FAT* 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- KRATZ, Reinhard G. "Friend of God, Brother of Sarah, and Father of Isaac: Abraham in the Hebrew Bible and in Qumran." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 79–105. *FAT* 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- KUGEL, James. "פרשנות המקרא בקומראן [Biblical Interpretation at Qumran]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World]*, ed. Menahem Kister, 2:387–408. 2 vols. *Between Bible and Mishnah*. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- KVASNICA, Brian. "Shifts in Israelite Ethics and Early Jewish Historiography of Plundering." In *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, ed. Brad E. Kelle and Frank R. Ames, 175–196. *SBLSymS* 42. Atlanta: SBL, 2008.
- LAATO, Antti, and Jacques T. A. G. M. VAN RUITEN, eds. *Rewritten Bible Reconsidered: Proceedings of the Conference in Karkku, Finland, August 24–26, 2006*. *Studies in Rewritten Bible* 1. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- LANFRANCHI, Pierluigi. "Moses' Vision of the Divine Throne in the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian." In *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence*,

- ed. Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, 53–59. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007.
- LANGE, Armin. “Between Zion and Heaven: The New Jerusalem Text from Qumran as a Paratext.” In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 397–412. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- LANGE, Armin. *Handbuch der Textfunde vom Toten Meer: Band 1: Die Handschriften biblischer Bücher von Qumran und den anderen Fundorten*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- LANGE, Armin. “Sages and Scribes in the Qumran Literature.” In *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, 271–293. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- LANGE, Armin. “Satanic Verses: The Adversary in the Qumran Manuscripts and Elsewhere.” *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 35–48.
- LANGE, Armin. “‘They Confirmed the Reading’ (y. Ta’an. 4:68a): The Textual Standardization of Jewish Scriptures in the Second Temple Period.” In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 29–80. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- LANGE, Armin. “‘Which is Written in the Words of Isaiah, Son of Amoz, the Prophet’ (CD 7.10): Quotations of and Allusions to the Book of Isaiah in Qumran Literature.” In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 275–287. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- LANGE, Armin, Matthias WEIGOLD, and József ZSENGELLÉR, eds. *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- LANGLOIS, Michael. *Le premier manuscrit du Livre d’Hénoch: Etude épigraphique et philologique des fragments araméens de 4Q201 à Qumrân*. Lectio Divina. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- LANGLOIS, Michael. “Livre d’Hénoch (4Q201; 4Q202; 4Q204; 4Q205; 4Q206; 4Q207; 4Q212; XQpapHénoch);” “Livre astronomique d’Hénoch (4Q208; 4Q209; 4Q210; 4Q211);” “Livre des Géants (1Q23; 1Q24; 2Q26; 4Q203; 4Q206^a; 4Q530; 4Q531; 4Q532; 4Q533; 6Q8);” “Paroles de Michel (4Q529).” In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, 1. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 13–95; 97–151; 153–243; 245–247. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- LATOUR, Jean-Baptiste. “Testament de Joseph araméen (4Q539);” “Composition narrative et poétique (2Q22; 4Q371–372–373).” In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, 1. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 493–497; 499–521. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- LEGRAND, Thierry. “Méditation sur la création A–C (4Q303–304–305);” “Les temps de la création A–B (4Q180–181);” “Homélie sur le Déluge

- (4Q370)”; “Interprétations sur le thème du Déluge (4Q577)”; “Exercice d’écriture sur quelques mots de la Genèse (4Q234)”; “Apocryphe de Jacob araméen (4Q537)”; “Testament de Nephtali hébreu (4Q215)”; “Composition apocryphe autour de l’histoire de Joseph (Mas 1m 1045–1350; 1375)”; “Apocryphe de Juda araméen (4Q538)”; “Fragments en rapport avec le *Testament de Juda* (3Q7).” In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, I. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 1–5; 271–281; 283–289; 291–297; 399–401; 403–415; 487–491; 523–527; 529–533; 535–539. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- LEVENSON, David B., and Thomas R. MARTIN. “Akairos or Eukairos? The Nickname of the Seleucid King Demetrius III in the Transmission of the Texts of Josephus’ *War* and *Antiquities*.” *JSJ* 40/3 (2009) 307–341.
- LEVINE, Amy-Jill. “Luke’s Pharisees.” In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 113–130. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- LEVINE, Lee I., and Daniel R. SCHWARTZ, eds. *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menaham Stern*. TSAJ 130. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- LEVINSON, Bernard M. *L’Herméneutique de l’innovation: Canon et exégèse dans l’Israël biblique*. Le livre et le rouleau 24. Brussels: Éditions Lessius, 2005.
- LEVINSON, Bernard M. *Legal Revision and Religious Renewal in Ancient Israel*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2008.
- LEVINSON, Bernard M., and Gary N. KNOPPERS, eds. *The Pentateuch as Torah: New Models for Understanding Its Promulgation and Acceptance*. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2007.
- LICHTENBERGER, Hermann. “Demonology in the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament.” In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 267–280. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- LICHTENBERGER, Hermann, and Ulrike MITTMANN-RICHT, eds. *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- LIESEN, Jan. “A Common Background of Ben Sira and the Psalter: The Concept of תורה in Sir 32:14–33:3 and the Torah Psalms.” In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia, 197–208. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- LIGHTSTONE, Jack N. “The Pharisees and the Sadducees in the Earliest Rabbinic Documents.” In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 255–295. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- LIM, Timothy H. “Towards a Description of the Sectarian Matrix.” In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 7–31. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- LINDQVIST, Pekka. *Sin at Sinai: Early Judaism Encounters Exodus 32. Studies in Rewritten Bible 2*. Turku, Finland: Åbo Akademi University, 2008.
- LOADER, James A. "Creating New Contexts: On the Possibilities of Biblical Studies in Contexts Generated by the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Journal for Semitics* 18/1 (2009) 82–104.
- LOADER, William R. G. "The Beginnings of Sexuality in Genesis LXX and Jubilees." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 300–312. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- LOADER, William R. G. *The Dead Sea Scrolls on Sexuality: Attitudes towards Sexuality in Sectarian and Related Literature at Qumran*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.
- LOADER, William R. G. "Jubilees and Sexual Transgression: Reflections on Enochic and Mosaic Tradition." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 48–54.
- LOCKETT, Darian R. "The Spectrum of Wisdom and Eschatology in the Epistle of James and 4QInstruction." *Tyndale Bulletin* 56/1 (2005) 131–148.
- LOURIÉ, Basil. "Les quatre jours 'de l'intervalle': une modification néotestamentaire et chrétienne du calendrier de 364 jours." In *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 103–133. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- LOURIÉ, Basil, Andrei ORLOV, and M. PETIT, eds. *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- MACHIELA, Daniel A. "Who is the Aramean in Deut 26:5 and what is He Doing? Evidence of a Minority View from Qumran Cave 1 (*1QapGen* 19.8)." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 395–403.
- MARCIAK, Michał. "Odkrycia w Wadi Dalijeh a Samaria w okresie perskim [Discoveries in Wadi Dalijeh and Samaria in the Persian Period]." *Studia Judaica* 11/1 (2008) 1–29.
- MARQUIS, Timothy Luckritz. "Re-Presenting Galilean Identity: Josephus's use of 1 Maccabees 10:25–45 and the Term 'Ioudaios'." In *Religion, Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Galilee: A Region in Transition*, ed. Jürgen Zangenberg, Harold W. Attridge and Dale B. Martin, 55–67. WUNT 210. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- MARTTILA, Marko. "'Statute' or 'Covenant'? Remarks on the Rendering of the Word קה in the Greek Ben Sira." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 73–87. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- MASON, Eric F. "Interpretation of Psalm 2 in *4QFlorilegium* and in the New Testament." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 67–82. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- MASON, Steve. "Did the Essenes Write the Dead Sea Scrolls? Don't Rely on Josephus." *BAR* 34/6 (2008) 61–65, 81.
- MASON, Steve. "The Greeks and the Distant Past in Josephus' Judean War." In *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloh, 93–130. TSAJ 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- MASON, Steve. "Josephus's Pharisees: The Narratives." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 3–40. Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- MASON, Steve. "Josephus's Pharisees: The Philosophy." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 41–66. Waco, Tex: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- MASON, Steve. *Josephus, Judea, and Christian Origins: Methods and Categories*. Peabody, Mass.: Hendrickson, 2009.
- MASON, Steve. "Judaism—Back to Basics." *BAR* 35/6 (2009) 30–32, 80.
- MASON, Steve. "Of Despots, Diadems, and *Diadochoi*: Josephus and Flavian Politics." In *Writing Politics in Imperial Rome*, ed. W. J. Dominik, J. Garthwaite and P. A. Roche, 323–349. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- MCCREADY, Wayne O., and Adele REINHARTZ. "Common Judaism and Diversity within Judaism." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 1–10. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- MCCREADY, Wayne O., and Adele REINHARTZ, eds. *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- MCDONALD, Lee Martin. "Wherein Lies Authority? A Discussion of Books, Texts, and Translations." In *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, 203–239. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- MEIER, John P. "The Historical Jesus and the Historical Sabbath." In *Rede-fining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 297–307. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- METSO, Sarianna. "Shifts in Covenantal Discourse in Second Temple Judaism." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 497–512. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- MEYERS, Eric M. "Sanders's 'Common Judaism' and the Common Judaism of Material Culture." In *Rede-fining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 153–174. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- MICHNIEWICZ, Jacek. *Qumran and Jericho Pottery: A Petrographic and Chemical Provenance Study*. Poznan: Adam Mickiewicz University Press, 2009.

- MILLER, David M. "Who Do You Follow? The Jewish Politeia and the Maccabean Background of Josephus's Sign Prophets." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 173–184. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- MINISSALE, Antonino. "The Metaphor for 'Falling': Hermeneutic Key to the Book of Sirach." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 253–276. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- MITCHELL, David C. "A Dying and Rising Josephite Messiah in 4Q372." *JSP* 18/3 (2009) 181–205.
- MITTMANN-RICHERT, Ulrike. "Joseph und Aseneth: Die Weisheit Israels und die Weisheit der Heiden." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 239–280. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- MIZRAHI, Noam. "Twelfth International Orion Symposium: 'Hebrew in the Second Temple Period: The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and of Other Contemporary Sources' (December 29–31, 2008; Hebrew University of Jerusalem, Israel)." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 230–232.
- MIZRAHI, Noam. "מן המנצח שבמקרא אל המזמור לדוד' בקומראן: לביאורו של נתון מוקשה ברשימת 'חיבורי דוד' שבמגילה 11QPs^a על רקע מעמדו של השורש נצ"ח בלשון הבית השני [The Number of David's Psalms (11QPs^a 27:4–5): A New Proposal]." In *מחקרים בלשון יא-יב: ספר היובל לאבי הורביץ* [*Language Studies XI–XII: Avi Hurvitz Festschrift*], ed. Steven E. Fassberg and Aharon Maman, 199–212. Jerusalem: Department of Hebrew and Jewish Languages, Hebrew University, 2008.
- MIZRAHI, Noam. "שאלת הזיקה בין שירות עולת השבת לספרות ההיכלות: היבט" [The Supposed Relationship between the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and Hekhalot Literature: Linguistic and Stylistic Aspects]." In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 263–298. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- MOORE, Anne. "The Search for the Common Judaic Understanding of God's Kingship." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 131–141. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- MOR, Uri. "סדר המילים בשטרות ובאיגרות ממדבר יהודה" [Word Order in the Legal Documents and Letters from the Judean Desert]." In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 237–261. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- MOSSER, Carl. "Rahab Outside the Camp." In *The Epistle to the Hebrews and Christian Theology*, ed. Richard Bauckham, Daniel R. Driver, Trevor A. Hart and Nathan MacDonald, 383–404. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2009.

- MROCZEK, Eva. "Moses, David and Scribal Revelation: Preservation and Renewal in Second Temple Jewish Textual Traditions." In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 91–115. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- MUNOA, Phillip B. III. "John, Jesus, and Metatron: Mediators, Knowledge, and the Importance of a Neglected Interpretation." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 415–437. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- MURAOKA, Takamitsu. "Notae Qumranicae Philologicae (4b) on the Community Rule." In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלאת לו שנים שישים וחמש שנה* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, *115–*125. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- NAHMAN, David. "תפילין ומזוזות בקומראן" [Tefillin and Mezuzot at Qumran]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:143–155. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- NAJMAN, Hindy. "Philosophical Contemplation and Revelatory Inspiration in Ancient Judean Traditions." *Studia Philonica Annual* 19 (2007) 101–111.
- NETZER, Ehud. *The Architecture of Herod, the Great Builder*. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- NEUSNER, Jacob. "The Pharisaic Agenda: Laws Attributed in the Mishnah and the Tosefta to Pre-70 Pharisees." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 313–327. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- NEUSNER, Jacob. "The Rabbinic Traditions about the Pharisees Before 70 CE: An Overview." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 297–311. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- NEWMAN, Judith H. "Priestly Prophets at Qumran: Summoning Sinai through the Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice." In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 29–72. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- NEWMAN, Judith H. "The Staff of Moses and the Mercy of God: Moses' Final Intercession in Pseudo-Philo 19." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 133–152. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- NIEHR, Herbert. "Die Gestalt des Ahiqar im Tobit-Buch." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 57–76. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

- NISSAN, Ephraim. "On Nebuchadnezzar in Pseudo-Sirach." *JSP* 19/1 (2009) 45–76.
- NISSINEN, Martti. "Transmitting Divine Mysteries: The Prophetic Role of Wisdom Teachers in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 513–533. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "Ancient Jewish Traditions of Biblical Commentary in Qumran Literature." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 288–300. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "Moses' Penitential-Like Prayer in Jubilees 1 and its Relation to the Penitential Tradition of Post-Exilic Judaism." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 35–41.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "ליטורגיה בקומראן: תפילות הקבע" [The Liturgy at Qumran: Statutory Prayers]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:225–260. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "החכמה מקומראן מאפיינים סגנוניים בספרות" [Typical Styles in the Wisdom Literature from Qumran]. In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים* [*Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 319–346. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "מגילות הפשרים מקומראן" [The *Pesharim* Scrolls from Wumran]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:169–190. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- NITZAN, Bilhah. "פשר ומדרש במגילות קומראן" [Peshar and Midrash in the Qumran Scrolls]. In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 99–127. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- NOAM, Vered. "Stringency in Qumran: A Reassessment." *JSJ* 40/3 (2009) 342–355.
- NOAM, Vered. "בין ספרות קומראן למדרש ההלכה: לשחזורו של פולמוס פרשני" [Qumranic Exegesis and Rabbinic Midrash: Common Interpretations and Implied Polemics]. In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 71–98. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- NOAM, Vered, and Elisha QIMRON. "A Qumran Composition of Sabbath Laws and Its Contribution to the Study of Early Halakah." *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 55–96.
- NORTON, Jonathan. "The Question of Scribal Exegesis at Qumran." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif

- Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrens-vård, 135–154. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- OEGEMA, Gerbern S., ed. *Pseudepigrapha and Christian Origins: Essays from the Studiorum Novi Testamenti Societas*. London: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- ÖHLER, Markus. “Wasser in der Wüste: Ex 17 und Num 20f in den Texten von Qumran und bei Paulus.” In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 413–440. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- OESCH, Josef M. “Formale und materiale Gliederungshermeneutik der Penta-teuch-Handschriften von Qumran.” In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 81–122. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- OLIVER, Isaac W. “The Book of Jubilees: An Annotated Bibliography from the First German Translation of 1850 to the Enoch Seminar of 2007.” *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 123–164.
- OLSON, Daniel C. “‘Enoch and the Son of Man’ Revisited: Further Reflections on the Text and Translation of *1 Enoch* 70.1–2.” *JSP* 18/3 (2009) 233–240.
- OMERZU, Heike. “Die Rezeption von Psalm 22 im Judentum zur Zeit des Zweiten Tempels.” In *Psalm 22 und die Passionsgeschichten der Evangelien*, ed. Dieter Sänger, 33–76. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag, 2007.
- ORLOV, Andrei. “In the Mirror of the Divine Face: The Enochic Features of the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the Tragedian.” In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 183–199. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- ORLOV, Andrei. “Vested with Adam’s Glory: Moses as the Luminous Counterpart of Adam in the Dead Sea Scrolls and in the Macarian Homilies.” In *L’Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 135–152. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- ORLOV, Andrei A. “Arboreal Metaphors and Polemics with the Divine Body Traditions in the *Apocalypse of Abraham*.” *HTR* 102 (2009) 439–451.
- ORLOV, Andrei A. *Divine Manifestations in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. Orientalia Judaica Christiana 2. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.
- ORLOV, Andrei A. *Selected Studies in the Slavonic Pseudepigrapha*. Studia in Veteris Testamenti Pseudepigrapha 23. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- ORLOV, Andrei A. “The Pteromorphic Angelology of the Apocalypse of Abraham.” *Catholic Biblical Quarterly* 72 (2009) 830–842.
- PAJUNEN, Mika S. “Qumranic Psalm 91: A Structural Analysis.” In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 591–605. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- PALMISANO, Maria Carmela. "Il 'background' veterotestamentario nella descrizione del sapiente ideale in Sir 39,6–8." *Rivista Biblica* 56/3 (2008) 277–298.
- PARRY, Donald W. "Verbal Imperative Variations in Qumran Texts and in Biblical Texts." In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלאות שנה* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, *127–*142. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- PASSARO, Angelo. "The Secrets of God: Investigation into Sir. 3:21–24." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia, 155–172. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- PASSARO, Angelo, and Giuseppe BELLIA. "Sirach, or the Metamorphosis of the Sage." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Giuseppe Bellia, 355–373. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin, 2008.
- PASSARO, Angelo, and Giuseppe BELLIA, eds. *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- PAUL, André. "Les écrits de Qumrân, la société juive et le christianisme." *Recherches de Science Religieuse* 97/1 (2009) 75–106.
- PEARCE, Sarah. "Translating for Ptolemy: Patriotism and Politics in the Greek Pentateuch?" In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 165–189. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- PELEG, Yehoshua. "המתחם המקודש הקדם-הרודיאני" [The Pre-Herodian Sanctified Temple Area and Outer Court]. *New Studies on Jerusalem* 14 (2008) 169–193.
- PERDUE, Leo G. *The Sword and the Stylus: An Introduction to Wisdom in the Age of Empires*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008.
- PERRIN, Andrew B. "Lost in Translation(s)? Ascertaining the Impact and Influence of the Dead Sea Scrolls on Contemporary English Bible Translations through an Investigative Case Study on the Psalms." *McMaster Journal of Theology and Ministry* 9 (2008–2009) 72–95.
- PETERS, Dorothy M. "Noah Traditions in Jubilees: Evidence for the Struggle between Enochic and Mosaic Authority." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 116–122.
- PETERS, Dorothy M. *Noah Traditions in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Conversations and Controversies of Antiquity*. SBLEJL 26. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- PETERS, Dorothy M. "The Primacy and Shunning of a Priestly Noah in 4QCommentary on Genesis A–D and the Damascus Document at Qumran." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 301–309. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.

- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Apologetik i Aristéas." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 45–67. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Aristobul som apologetisk skrift." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 69–95. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Filon som apologet—en læsning af *De migratione Abrahama*." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 233–261. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Jødisk apologetik—forskningshistorisk og historisk." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 15–43. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Makkabærbogslitteraturen i et apologetisk perspektiv." In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 115–153. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard. "Reconstructing Past (Jewish) Cultures." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 367–383. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard, Torleif ELGVIN, Cecilia WASSEN, Hanne von WEISSENBERG, Mikael WINNINGE, and Martin EHRENSVÄRD, eds. *North-ern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- PETERSEN, Anders Klostergaard, Jesper HYLDAHL, and Kåre Sigvald FUGLSETH, eds. *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- PÉTIGNY, Amaury. "La bibliothèque d'Alexandrie et la littérature judéo-hellénistique." *Tsafon* 56 (2008–2009) 29–42.
- PFANN, Stephen J. "A Reassessment of Qumran's Calendars." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 104–110.
- PHILONENKO, Marc. "Romains 7,23, une glose qoumrânisante sur Job 40,32 (Septante) et trois textes qoumrâniens." *Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuses* 87/3 (2007) 257–265.
- PICKUP, Martin. "Matthew's and Mark's Pharisees." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 67–112. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.

- PILARCZYK, Krzysztof. "Apokryfy judaistyczne: Obce elementy w religijnej tradycji żydowskiej? Z dziejów kanonu pism świętych judaizmu [Apocrypha: Alien Elements in Jewish Religious Tradition? From the History of the Canon of the Holy Scriptures of Judaism]." *Studia Judaica* 11/1 (2008) 31–42.
- PILCH, John J. "Music in 2nd (Slavonic) Enoch." *Biblical Theology Bulletin* 39/4 (2009) 214–221.
- POMYKALA, Kenneth E. "The Covenant with Phinehas in Ben Sira (Sirach 45:23–26; 50:22–24)." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 17–36. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- POMYKALA, Kenneth E., ed. *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- POPOVIĆ, Mladen. "Astronomie en astrologie in het vroege Jodendom en de Dode-Zeerollen." *Phoenix* 53/2–2 (2007) 100–121.
- POPOVIĆ, Mladen. "Reading the Human Body and Discerning Zodiacal Spirits: A Proposal for the Use of Physiognomics in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Kloostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensverd, 155–172. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- PORZIG, Peter. "The Ark of the Covenant in the Non-Biblical Texts from Qumran." In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 203–218. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- PORZIG, Peter. *Die Lade Jahwes im Alten Testament und in den Texten vom Toten Meer [The Ark of Yahweh in the Old Testament and in the Dead Sea Scrolls]*. BZAW 397. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- PUECH, Émile. "4QSamuel^a (4Q51): Notes épigraphiques et nouvelles identifications." In *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, 373–386. BETL 224. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- PUECH, Émile. "Ben Sira and Qumran." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 79–118. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- PUECH, Émile. "Le Testament de Lévi araméen, Cambridge a–b et f: Corrigenda et addenda." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 543–561.
- PUECH, Émile, ed. *Qumran Grotte 4.XXVII: Textes en Arameen, deuxième partie*. DJD 37. Oxford: Clarendon, 2008.
- PUECH, Émile, and Farah MÉBARKI. *Los Manuscritos del Mar Muerto: Nueva edición revisada*. Buenos Aires: Centro de Estudios de Historia del Antiguo Oriente, 2009.

- QIMRON, Elisha. "בעיות פיענוח וההדרה במגילות קומראן" [Problems in Reading and Editing the Qumran Scrolls]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:91–106. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- QIMRON, Elisha. "הלשון והרקע הלשוני של כתבי קומראן" [The Language and Linguistic Background of the Qumran Compositions]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:551–560. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- RABIN, Ira, Oliver HAHN, Timo WOLFF, Admir MASIC, and Gisela WEINBERG. "On the Origin of the Ink of the Thanksgiving Scroll (1QHodayot^a)." *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 97–106.
- RAJAK, Tessa. "The Angry Tyrant." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 110–127. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- RAJAK, Tessa. "Translating the Septuagint for Ptolemy's Library: Myth and History." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 176–193. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- RAJAK, Tessa. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible and the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009.
- RAJAK, Tessa, Sarah PEARCE, James K. AITKEN, and Jennifer DINES, eds. *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- RAPPAPORT, Uriel. "3 Maccabees and the Jews of Egypt." *JQR* 99/4 (2009) 551–557.
- RAVASCO, Andrea. "Reflections about the Textual Transmission of the Books of Samuel." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 405–413.
- REED, Annette Yoshiko. "The Construction and Subversion of Patriarchal Perfection: Abraham and Exemplarity in Philo, Josephus, and the Testament of Abraham." *JSJ* 40/2 (2009) 185–212.
- REGEV, Eyal. "Access Analysis of Khirbet Qumran: Reading Spatial Organization and Social Boundaries." *BASOR* 335 (2009) 85–99.
- REGEV, Eyal. "Temple and Righteousness in Qumran and Early Christianity: Tracing the Social Difference between the Two Movements." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 63–87. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- REGEV, Eyal. "Wealth and Sectarianism: Comparing Qumranic and Early Christian Social Approaches." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 211–229. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- REIF, Stefan C. "The Figure of David in Early Jewish Prayer." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 509–546. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- REINHARTZ, Adele. "Crucifying Caiaphas: Hellenism and the High Priesthood in Life of Jesus Narratives." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 227–245. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- REINHARTZ, Adele. "We, You, They: Boundary Language in 4QMMT and the New Testament Epistles." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 89–105. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- REITERER, Friedrich V. "The Interpretation of the Wisdom Tradition of the Torah within Ben Sira." In *The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Studies on Tradition, Redaction, and Theology*, ed. Angelo Passaro and Guiseppe Bellia, 209–232. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Studies 1. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2008.
- REITERER, Friedrich V. "The Sociological Significance of the Scribe as the Teacher of Wisdom in Ben Sira." In *Scribes, Sages and Seers: The Sage in the Eastern Mediterranean World*, ed. Leo G. Perdue, 219–243. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2008.
- REITERER, Friedrich V. "Urtext oder Ausgangstext: Beispiele zur Textentwicklung der sirazidischen Textes." In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 123–140. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- REDSBURG, Gary A. "Linguistic and Stylistic Notes to the *Hazon Gabriel* Inscription." *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 107–116.
- REY, Jean-Sébastien. "Un apocryphe mentionnant Rachel (4Q474)." In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, I. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 417–419. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- REY, Jean-Sébastien. "Un nouveau bifeuillet du manuscrit C de la Genizah du Caire." In *Florilegium Lovaniense: Studies in Septuagint and Textual Criticism in Honour of Florentino García Martínez*, ed. Hans Ausloos, Bénédicte Lemmelijn and Marc Vervenne, 387–416. BETL 224. Leuven: Peeters, 2008.
- REY, Jean-Sébastien. *4QInstruction: Sagesse et eschatologie*. STDJ 81. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- REY, Jean-Sébastien. "Family Relationships in 4QInstruction and in Eph 5:21–6:4." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testa-*

- ment, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 231–255. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- RISKA, Magnus. “The Temple Scroll: Is it More or Less Biblical?” In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 607–613. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- RODGERS, Zuleika. “Josephus’ ‘Theokratia’ and Mosaic Discourse: The Actualization of the Revelation at Sinai.” In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 129–148. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- ROSENBLUM, Jordan D. “Kosher Olive Oil in Antiquity Reconsidered.” *JSJ* 40/3 (2009) 356–365.
- ROWLAND, Christopher, and Christopher R. A. MORRAY-JONES. *The Mystery of God: Early Jewish Mysticism and the New Testament*. CRINT 12. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- RUZER, Serge. “Exegetical Patterns Common to the Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, and Their Implications.” In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 231–251. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- RYAN, Stephen D. “The Rabshakeh in Late Biblical and Post-Biblical Tradition.” In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 183–198. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- SALEY, Richard J. “Proto-Lucian and 4QSam^a.” *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 41 (2008) 34–45.
- SANDERS, E. P. “Common Judaism Explored.” In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 11–23. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- SAPERSTEIN, Harold I., introduced by Marc Saperstein and annotated by Jason Kalman. “A Spiritually Powerful Sect of Judaism: Two Sermons on the Dead Sea Scrolls by Rabbi Harold I. Saperstein.” *American Jewish Archives Journal* 61/1 (2009) 144–161.
- SARASON, Richard S. “The Persistence and Trajectories of Penitential Prayer in Rabbinic Judaism.” In *Seeking the Favor of God, Volume 3: The Impact of Penitential Prayer beyond Second Temple Judaism*, ed. Mark J. Boda, Daniel K. Falk and Rodney A. Werline, 1–38. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SARTRE, Maurice. “Un romain face à l’énigme juive.” *Le Monde de la Bible* 182 (2008) 25–27.
- SAUKKONEN, Juhana. “Dwellers at Qumran: Reflections on Their Literacy, Social Status, and Identity.” In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija*

- Sollamo, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 615–627. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- SAUKKONEN, Juhana. “A Few Inkwell, Many Hands: Were There Scribes at Qumran?” In *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, 538–553. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008.
- SAUKKONEN, Juhana. “Selection, Election, and Rejection: Interpretation of Genesis in 4Q252.” In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensivärd, 63–81. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SAULNIER, Stéphane. “Jub. 49:1–14 and the (Absent) Second Passover: How (and Why) to Do Away with an Unwanted Festival.” *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 42–48.
- SCHÄFER, Peter. *The Origins of Jewish Mysticism*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- SCHATTNER-RIESER, Ursula. “La Bibliothèque d’Eléphantine.” *Tsafon* 56 (2008–2009) 13–27.
- SCHATTNER-RIESER, Ursula. “La Bibliothèque de Qumrân.” *Tsafon* 56 (2008–2009) 43–60.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H. “60 Years with the Dead Sea Scrolls: Part 2.” *BAR* 33/4 (2007) 51–53.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H. “Codification of Jewish Law in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Chaim Cohen and Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, 2:917–926. 2 vols. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H. “Halakhic Terminology in the Dead Sea Scrolls.” *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 115–133.
- SCHIFFMAN, Lawrence H. “Temple, Sacrifice, and Priesthood in the Epistle to the Hebrews and the Dead Sea Scrolls.” In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 165–176. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SCHIFFMAN, Yehuda (Lawrence H.). “ספר ברית דמשק ומגילת הסרכים [The Damascus Document and the Serakhim].” In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World]*, ed. Menahem Kister, 1:275–298. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- SCHMID, Konrad. “Loss of Immortality? Hermeneutical Aspects of Genesis 2–3 and its Early Receptions.” In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*, ed. Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 58–78. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- SCHMITZ, Barbara. “The Construction of Role Patterns in the Book of Judith.” In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 77–94. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.

- SCHOFIELD, Alison. *From Qumran to the Yahad: A New Paradigm of Textual Development for the Community Rule*. STDJ 77. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SCHOFIELD, Alison. "The Wilderness Motif in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 37–53. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- SCHULLER, Eileen. "Women in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Some Observations from a Dictionary." *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 49–59.
- SCHULLER, Eileen M. מגילת ההודיות [The Thanksgiving Hymns (*Hodayot*)]. In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:261–273. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- SCHULTZ, Brian. *Conquering the World: The War Scroll (1QM) Reconsidered*. STDJ 76. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SCHULTZ, Brian. "מגילת מלחמת בני אור ובני חושך: הצד הספרותי" [The Literary Structure of the War Scroll]. In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:321–340. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "Circular or Teleological, Universal or Particular, With God or Without? On 1–2 Maccabees and Acts." In *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie* [Acts of the Apostles in the Context of Ancient and Early Christian Historiography], ed. Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild, Jens Schröter and Bettina Rost, 119–129. BZNW 162. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "Joseph M. Baumgarten (1928–2008)." *JJS* 60/1 (2009) 1–4.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "One Temple and Many Synagogues: On Religion and State in Herodian Judaea and Augustan Rome." In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Held at the IJS Conference, 21st–23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 385–398. IJS Studies in Judaica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "Remembering the Second Temple Period: Josephus and the Rabbis, Apologetics and Rabbinical Training." In *Erinnerung als Herkunft der Zukunft: Zum Jubiläumssymposium des Instituts für Jüdisch-Christliche Forschung an der Universität Luzern (17.–19. September 2006)*, ed. Verena Lenzen, 63–83. Bern: Peter Lang, 2008.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "Special People or Special Books? On Qumran and New Testament Notions of Canon." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 49–60. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "כת מדבר יהודה והאיסיים" [The Dead Sea Sect and the Essenes]. In מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:601–612. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.

- SCHWARTZ, Daniel R. "קומראן והנצרות הקדומה" [Qumran and Early Christianity]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:613–628. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- SCHWARTZ, Joshua Jay. "The Temple Cult without the Sages: Prolegomena on the Description of the Second Temple Period Cult According to Sources of the Second Temple Period." *New Studies on Jerusalem* 14 (2008) 7*–19*.
- SCHWARTZ, Seth. "Memory in Josephus and the Culture of the Jews in the First Century." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 185–194. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- SCHWEMER, Anna Maria. "Vitae Prophetarum und Neues Testament." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 199–230. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- SCOLNIC, Benjamin Edidin. *Thy Brother's Blood: The Maccabees and Dynastic Morality in the Hellenistic World*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2008.
- SCOTT, Ian W. "Epistemology and Social Conflict in *Jubilees* and *Aristeas*." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 195–213. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- SEGAL, Michael. "בין פרשנות לכיתתיות: אור וחושך במצרים ובירושלים במגילה 4Q462 [Between Exegesis and Sectarianism: 'Light and Darkness' in Egypt and in Jerusalem According to 4Q462]." In *מגילות: מחקרים* [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 129–143. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- SEN, Felipe. "La investigación sobre Qumrán en uno de sus principales representantes: Florentino García Martínez." *Gerión* 26 (2008) 103–110.
- SHAHAR, Yuval. "לבחינת המונח 'הר הבית' בתקופת הבית השני" [The Concept of the Temple Mount in the Second Temple Period]. *New Studies on Jerusalem* 14 (2008) 203–209.
- SHANKS, Hershel. "Inscription Reveals Roots of Maccabean Revolt." *BAR* 34/6 (2008) 56–59.
- SHATZMAN, Israel. "מגילת מלחמת בני אור בבני חושך: היבטים צבאיים" [The Military Aspects of the War Rule]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [The Qumran Scrolls and Their World], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:341–383. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- SHEMESH, Aharon. *Halakhah in the Making: The Development of Jewish Law from Qumran to the Rabbis*. The Taubman Lectures in Jewish Studies 6. California: University of California Press, 2009.
- SHEMESH, Aharon. "מסורות הלכה ופירוש המשותפות למגילות מדבר יהודה" [Common Halakhic and Exegetical Traditions Shared by

- DSS and Rabbinic Literature].” In *מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 383–394. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- SIEVERS, Joseph. “Herod, Josephus, and Laqueur: A Reconsideration.” In *Herod and Augustus: Papers Held at the IJS Conference, 21st–23rd June 2005*, ed. David M. Jacobson and Nikos Kokkinos, 83–112. IJS Studies in Judaica 6. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- SINCLAIR, Lawrence A. “Climate at Qumran During the Hellenistic and Roman Periods.” *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 415–427.
- SIVAN, Daniel, David Talshir, and Chaim Cohen, eds. *מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון במלואות לו שישים וחמש שנה* [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday]. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- SPIECKERMANN, Hermann. “Is God’s Creation Good? From Hesiodus to Ben Sira.” In *Beyond Eden: The Biblical Story of Paradise (Genesis 2–3) and Its Reception History*, ed. Konrad Schmid and Christoph Riedweg, 79–94. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- STEGEMANN, Hartmut, Eileen SCHULLER, and Carol NEWSOM, eds. *Qumran Cave 1.III: 1QHodayot^a, with Incorporation of 4QHodayot^{a-f} and 1QHodayot^b*. DJD 40. Oxford: Clarendon, 2008.
- STEMBERGER, Günter. “Support for the Poor: Leviticus 19 in Qumran and in Early Rabbinic Interpretation.” In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 451–469. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- STERLING, Gregory E. “Turning to God: Conversion in Greek-Speaking Judaism and Early Christianity.” In *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity in Honor of Carl R. Holladay*, ed. Patrick Gray and Gail R. O’Day, 69–95. NovTSup 129. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- STEUDEL, Annette. “Dating Exegetical Texts from Qumran.” In *The Dynamics of Language and Exegesis at Qumran*, ed. Devorah Dimant and Reinhard G. Kratz, 39–53. FAT 35. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- STIPP, Hermann-Josef. “Der prämasoretische Idiolekt des Buches Ezechiel und seine Beziehungen zum Jeremiabuch.” In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 141–155. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- STIPP, Hermann-Josef. “Zur aktuellen Diskussion um das Verhältnis der Textformen des Jeremiabuches.” In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 630–653. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.

- STÖKL BEN EZRA, Daniel. "Deconstructing the So-Called *Genesis Apocryphon* from Masada (Mas 1m or MasapocrGen)." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 533–542.
- STÖKL BEN EZRA, Daniel. "Weighing the Parts: A Papyrological Perspective on the Parting of the Ways." *Novum Testamentum* 51/2 (2009) 168–186.
- STONE, Michael E. "Two Unpublished Eschatological Texts." *JSP* 18/4 (2009) 293–302.
- STRANGE, James F. "Archaeology and the Pharisees." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 237–251. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- STRATTON, Kimberly B. "The Eschatological Arena: Reinscribing Roman Violence in Fantasies of the End Times." *Biblical Interpretation: A Journal of Contemporary Approaches* 17/1–2 (2009) 45–76.
- STROMBERG, Jacob. "The Role of Redaction Criticism in the Evaluation of a Textual Variant: Another Look at 1QIsa^a XXXII 14 (38:21–22)." *DSD* 16/2 (2009) 155–189.
- STUCKENBRUCK, Loren T. "The Eschatological Worship of God by the Nations: An Inquiry into the Early Enoch Tradition." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 189–206. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- STUCKENBRUCK, Loren T. "To What Extent Did Philo's Treatment of Enoch and the Giants Presuppose a Knowledge of the Enochic and Other Sources Preserved in the Dead Sea Scrolls?" *Studia Philonica Annual* 19 (2007) 131–142.
- SWART, Gerhard. "Rahab and Esther in Josephus." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 471–486. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- TAL, Abraham. "מקומראן לשכם בנתיבים נעלמים" [From Qumran to Shekhem on Hidden Paths]. In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [*Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII*], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 227–235. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- TALMON, Shemaryahu, and Jonathan BEN-DOV. "Mishmarot Lists (4Q322–324c) and 'Historical Texts' (4Q322a, 4Q331–333) from Qumran." In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Chaim Cohen and Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, 2:927–942. 2 vols. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- TALSHIR, David, and Zipora TALSHIR. "כן נאמן לן עם בתולה" (בן סירה כ 4; 20): Transmission and Meaning. In *מחקרי לשון מוגשים לאלישע קימרון ז* [*Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 217–254. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.

- TALSHIR, Zipora. "המגילות המקראיות ממדבר יהודה" [Biblical Texts from the Judean Desert]. In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 1:109–141. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- TAMÁSI, Balázs. "Prophesized History of the Postexilic Period and Polemics Against Priests in 4Q390 from Qumran: Levite Authorship Behind the Fragments." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 310–328. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- TAYLOR, Joan E. "On Pliny, the Essene Location and Kh. Qumran." *DSD* 16/1 (2009) 1–21.
- TERVANOTKO, Hanna. "'The Hope of the Enemy has Perished': The Figure of Miriam in the Qumran Library." In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honour of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 156–175. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- THOMAS, Samuel I. "Enoch, Elijah and the (Eschatological) Torah." *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 54–59.
- TIGCHELAAR, Eibert J. C. "A Forgotten Qumran Cave 4 Deuteronomy Fragment (4Q38d=4QDeut)." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 525–528.
- TIGCHELAAR, Eibert J. C. "Lady Folly and Her House in Three Qumran Manuscripts: On the Relation between 4Q525 15, 5Q16, and 4Q184." *RevQ* 23/3 (2008) 371–381.
- TIGCHELAAR, Eibert J. C. "'Spiritual People,' 'Fleshly Spirit,' and 'Vision of Meditation': Reflections on 4QInstruction and 1 Corinthians." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 103–118. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- TILLY, Michael. "Die Rezeption des Danielbuches im hellenistischen Judentum." In *Die Geschichte der Daniel-Auslegung in Judentum, Christentum und Islam: Studien zur Kommentierung des Danielbuches in Literatur und Kunst*, ed. Katharina Bracht and David S. du Toit, 31–54. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- TIMMER, Daniel C. "Sectarianism and Soteriology. The Priestly Blessing (Numbers 6,24–26) in the Qumranite Community Rule (1QS)." *Biblica* 89/3 (2008) 389–396.
- TOMSON, Peter J. "'There is No One Who is Righteous, Not Even One': Kohelet 7,20 in Pauline and Early Jewish Interpretation." In *The Language of Qohelet in Its Context: Essays in Honour of Prof. A. Schoors on the Occasion of His Seventieth Birthday*, ed. A. Berlejung and P. van Hecke, 183–202. Orientalia Lovaniensia analecta 164. Leuven: Peeters, 2007.
- TOORN, Karel van der. *Scribal Culture and the Making of the Hebrew Bible*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.
- TOV, Emanuel. "Literary Analysis, the So-Called Original Text of Hebrew Scripture, and Textual Evaluation." In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Pre-*

- sented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday, ed. Chaim Cohen and Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, 2:943–963. 2 vols. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- Tov, Emanuel. “The Many Forms of Hebrew Scripture: Reflections in Light of the Septuagint and 4Q*Reworked Pentateuch*.” In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 11–28. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- Tov, Emanuel. “The Septuagint as a Source for the Literary Analysis of Hebrew Scripture.” In *Exploring the Origins of the Bible: Canon Formation in Historical, Literary, and Theological Perspective*, ed. Craig A. Evans and Emanuel Tov, 31–56. Acadia Studies in Bible and Theology. Grand Rapids: Baker, 2008.
- Tov, Emanuel. “Three Strange Books of the LXX: 1 Kings, Esther, and Daniel Compared with Similar Rewritten Compositions from Qumran and Elsewhere.” In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 369–393. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- TREHUEDIC, Kévin. “Commentaires de la Genèse A–D (4Q252–253–254–254^a).” In *La Bibliothèque de Qumrân, 1. Torah: Genèse. Edition bilingue des manuscrits*, ed. Katell Berthelot, Thierry Legrand and André Paul, 299–317. Paris: Cerf, 2008.
- TRETTI, Cristiana. “The Treasury of Heavenly Wisdom: Differing Modulational of the Concept from 1 Enoch and Jubilees to Medieval Jewish Mysticism.” *Henoch* 31/1 (2009) 60–65.
- TROMP, Johannes. “‘Can These Bones Live?’ Ezekiel 37:1–14 and Eschatological Resurrection.” In *The Book of Ezekiel and Its Influence*, ed. Henk Jan de Jonge and Johannes Tromp, 61–78. Aldershot, England: Ashgate, 2007.
- TROMPELT, Kevin. “Die masoretische Akzentuation als Spiegel abweichender Texttraditionen im Jesajabuch.” In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 176–188. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.
- TRONIER, Henrik. “Grænser for apologi.” In *Perspektiver på Jødisk Apologetik [Perspectives on Jewish Apologetics]*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Jesper Hyldahl and Kåre Sigvald Fuglseth, 207–231. Antikken og Kristendommen 4. Copenhagen: Forlaget ANIS, 2007.
- TRSTENSKÝ, František. *Kumrán a jeho zvitky*. Svit, Slovakia: Katolícke biblické dielo, 2009.
- Tso, Marcus. “The Giving of the Torah at Sinai and the Ethics of the Qumran Community.” In *The Significance of Sinai: Traditions about Sinai and Divine Revelation in Judaism and Christianity*, ed. George J. Brooke, Hindy Najman and Loren T. Stuckenbruck, 117–127. Themes in Biblical Narrative 12. Leiden: Brill, 2008.

- TUKASI, Emmanuel O. *Determinism and Petitionary Prayer in John and the Dead Sea Scrolls: An Ideological Reading of John and the Rule of the Community (1QS)*. LSTS 66. London: T&T Clark, 2008.
- TURNAGE, Marc. "Is It the Serpent that Heals? An Ancient Jewish Theologoumenon and the Developing Faith in Jesus." In *Israel in the Wilderness: Interpretations of the Biblical Traditions in Jewish and Christian Narratives*, ed. Kenneth E. Pomykala, 71–88. Themes in Biblical Narrative 10. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- TZOREF (BERRIN), Shani. "Qumran Pesharim and the Pentateuch: Explicit Citation, Overt Typologies, and Implicit Interpretive Traditions." *DSD* 16/2 (2009) 190–220.
- TZOREF (BERRIN), Shani. "גלות ונסתרות: התגלות נמשכת בתחומי החכמה והחוק" [The 'Hidden' and the 'Revealed': Progressive Revelation of Law and Esoterica]. In *מגילות: מחקרים במגילות מדבר יהודה ז* [Meghillot: Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls VII], ed. Moshe Bar-Asher and Devorah Dimant, 157–190. Jerusalem: Haifa University and Bialik Institute, 2009.
- UDOH, Fabian E., Susannah HESCHEL, Mark CHANCEY, and Gregory TATUM, eds. *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- UEBERSCHAER, Frank. *Weisheit aus der Begegnung: Bildung nach dem Buch Ben Sira*. BZAW 379. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2007.
- ULFGARD, Håkan. "The Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice and the Heavenly Scene of the Book of Revelation." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winnige and Martin Ehrensverd, 251–266.
- ULRICH, Eugene. "Light from 1QIsa^a on the Translation Technique of the Old Greek Translator of Isaiah." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 193–204. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- ULRICH, Eugene C. "Qumran Witness to the Developmental Growth of the Prophetic Books." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 263–274. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- VANDERKAM, James C. "The Aramaic Astronomical Book and the Ethiopic Book of the Luminaries." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 207–221. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- VANDERKAM, James C. "Jaubert's Solution to the Passion Chronology." In *L'Église des deux Alliances: Mémorial Annie Jaubert (1912–1980)*, ed. Basil Lourié, Andrei Orlov and M. Petit, 179–194. Piscataway: Gorgias Press, 2009.

- VANDERKAM, James C. "The Pharisees and the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *In Quest of the Historical Pharisees*, ed. Jacob Neusner and Bruce D. Chilton, 225–236. Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2007.
- VANDERKAM, James C. "Sources for the Astronomy in 1 Enoch 72–82." In *Birkat Shalom: Studies in the Bible, Ancient Near Eastern Literature, and Postbiblical Judaism Presented to Shalom M. Paul on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. Chaim Cohen and Victor Avigdor Hurowitz, 2:965–978. 2 vols. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- VÁZQUEZ ALLEGUE, Jaime. "El 'Sefer Ha-Hagy' de Qumrán [The Sefer Ha-Hagy of Qumran]." *Miscelánea de Estudios Árabes y Hebraicos* 57 (2008) 279–308.
- VENTURINI, Simone. "Le armonizzazioni nel testo di 4QSam^a." *Rivista Biblica* 56/1 (2008) 37–60.
- VERMES, Geza. "Jewish Attitudes to Afterlife in the Age of Jesus." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 349–359. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- VERMES, Geza. *Tradition and Interpretation in Early Judaism*. London: T&T Clark International, 2008.
- VIANÈS-ABOU SAMRA, Laurence. "La 'Lettre d'Aristée' et les origines de la Septante: À propos d'un livre récent." *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie Religieuses* 88/1 (2008) 71–76.
- VOGEL, Manuel. "Traumdarstellungen bei Josephus und Lukas." In *Die Apostelgeschichte im Kontext antiker und frühchristlicher Historiographie [Acts of the Apostles in the Context of Ancient and Early Christian Historiography]*, ed. Jörg Frey, Clare K. Rothschild, Jens Schröter and Bettina Rost, 130–158. BZNW 162. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- VOITILA, Anssi. "Differences in Order of Sentences, Lines, and Verses in the Hebrew and Greek Texts of Ben Sira." *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies* 41 (2008) 76–83.
- VOITILA, Anssi. "For Those Who Love Learning: How the Reader Is Persuaded to Study the Book of Ben Sira as a Translation." In *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, 451–460. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008.
- VOITILA, Anssi, and Jutta JOKIRANTA, eds. *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- WASSEN, Cecilia. "Jesus and the Hemorrhaging Woman in Mark 5:24–34: Insights from Purity Laws from Qumran." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 641–660. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- WASSEN, Cecilia. "What do Angels Have against the Blind and the Deaf? Rules of Exclusion in the Dead Sea Scrolls." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 115–129. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.

- WEISSENBERG, Hanne von. *4QMMT: Reevaluating the Text, the Function and the Meaning of the Epilogue*. STDJ 82. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- WEISSENBERG, Hanne von. "4QMMT: Some New Readings." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensverd, 217–221. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- WEISSENBERG, Hanne von. "'Canon' and Identity at Qumran: An Overview and Challenges for Future Research." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Raija Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 629–640. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- WEISSENBERG, Hanne von. "Deuteronomy at Qumran and in 4QMMT." In *Houses Full of All Good Things: Essays in Memory of Timo Veijola*, ed. Juha Pakkala and Martti Nissinen, 520–537. Helsinki: Finnish Exegetical Society, 2008.
- WEITZMAN, Steven. "Warring against Terror: The War Scroll and the Mobilization of Emotion." *JSJ* 40/2 (2009) 213–241.
- WERMAN, Cana. "A Messiah in Heaven? A Re-Evaluation of Jewish and Christian Apocalyptic Traditions." In *Text, Thought, and Practice in Qumran and Early Christianity: Proceedings of the Ninth International Symposium of the Orion Center for the Study of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Associated Literature, Jointly Sponsored by the Hebrew University Center for the Study of Christianity, 11–13 January, 2004*, ed. Ruth A. Clements and Daniel R. Schwartz, 281–299. STDJ 84. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- WERMAN, Cana. "אחרית הימים בהגות עדת קומראן" [Eschatology at Qumran]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:529–549. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- WERMAN, Cana. "מועדי הביכורים במגילת המקדש" [The First Fruit Festivals according to the Temple Scroll]." In *זפנת פנעה: מחקרי לשון מונושים* [*Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday*], ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 177–198. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.
- WERMAN, Cana, and Aharon SHEMESH. "ההלכה במגילות מדבר יהודה" [*Halakhah in the Dead Sea Scrolls*]." In *מגילות קומראן: מבואות ומחקרים* [*The Qumran Scrolls and Their World*], ed. Menahem Kister, 2:409–433. 2 vols. Between Bible and Mishnah. Jerusalem: Yad Izhak Ben-Zvi, 2009.
- WERRETT, Ian C. "The Perils of Prepublication: Essenes, Latrines, and the Dead Sea Scrolls." *Society of Biblical Literature Forum* 7/3 (2009) <http://www.sbl-site.org/publications/article.aspx?ArticleId=817>.
- WERRETT, Ian C. "The Reconstruction of 4QMMT: A Methodological Critique." In *Northern Lights on the Dead Sea Scrolls: Proceedings of the Nordic Qumran Network 2003–2006*, ed. Anders Klostergaard Petersen, Torleif Elgvin, Cecilia Wassen, Hanne von Weissenberg, Mikael Winninge and Martin Ehrensverd, 205–216. STDJ 80. Leiden: Brill, 2009.

- WERRETT, Ian C. "A Scroll in One Hand and a Mattock in the Other." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 475–489.
- WILKER, Julia. "Unabhängigkeit durch Integration: Zu den jüdisch-römischen Beziehungen im 2. Jahrhundert v. Chr." In *Die Septuaginta: Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 20.–23. Juli 2006*, ed. Martin Karrer and Wolfgang Kraus, 194–201. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- WILLS, Lawrence M. *Not God's People: Insiders and Outsiders in the Biblical World*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield, 2008.
- WILSON, Leslie S. *The Book of Job: Judaism in the Second Century BCE: An Intertextual Reading*. Studies in Judaism. Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 2006.
- WITTE, Markus. "Hiob und seine Frau in jüdischen Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 355–396. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- WOLD, Benjamin G. "Revelation's Plague Septets: New Exodus and Exile." In *Echoes from the Caves: Qumran and the New Testament*, ed. Florentino García Martínez, 279–297. STDJ 85. Leiden: Brill, 2009.
- WRIGHT, Benjamin G. III. "Ben Sira on Kings and Kingship." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, ed. Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James K. Aitken and Jennifer Dines, 76–91. Hellenistic Culture and Society 50. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2007.
- WRIGHT, Benjamin G. III. "Transcribing, Translating, and Interpreting in the Letter of Aristeas: On the Nature of the Septuagint." In *Scripture in Transition: Essays on Septuagint, Hebrew Bible, and Dead Sea Scrolls in Honour of Rajja Sollamo*, ed. Anssi Voitila and Jutta Jokiranta, 147–161. JSJSup 126. Leiden: Brill, 2008.
- XERAVITS, Géza G. "Remarks on the Miracles of Elisha in the *Lives of the Prophets* 22.5–20." In *With Wisdom as a Robe: Qumran and Other Jewish Studies in Honour of Ida Fröhlich*, ed. Károly Daniel Dobos and Miklós Köszeghy, 360–364. Hebrew Bible Monographs 121. Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix, 2009.
- XERAVITS, Géza G. "The Wonders of Elijah in the Lives of the Prophets." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 231–238. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- YOUNG, Ian. "Late Biblical Hebrew and the Qumran Peshet Habakkuk." *JHS* 8 (2008) http://www.arts.ualberta.ca/JHS/Articles/article_102.pdf.
- YUDITSKY, Alexey (Eliyahu). "חידושים בעקבות מחקריו של בעל היובל [Innovations as a Result of Prof. Qimron's Studies]." In *צפנת פענח: מחקרי לשון [Zaphenath-Paneah: Linguistic Studies Presented to Elisha Qimron on the Occasion of His Sixty-Fifth Birthday]*, ed. Daniel Sivan, David Talshir and Chaim Cohen, 255–260. Beer-Sheva: Beer-Sheva University Press, 2009.

- ZANELLA, Francesco. "'Sectarian' and 'Non-Sectarian' Texts: A Possible Semantic Approach." *RevQ* 24/1 (2009) 19–34.
- ZANGENBERG, Jürgen. "Common Judaism and the Multidimensional Character of Material Culture." In *Redefining First-Century Jewish and Christian Identities: Essays in Honor of Ed Parish Sanders*, ed. Fabian E. Udoh, Susannah Heschel, Mark Chancey and Gregory Tatum, 175–193. Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity Series 16. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2008.
- ZELLENTIN, H. M. "The End of Jewish Egypt: Artapanus and the Second Exodus." In *Antiquity in Antiquity: Jewish and Christian Pasts in the Greco-Roman World*, ed. Gregg Gardner and Kevin L. Osterloh, 27–73. TSAJ 123. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2008.
- ZEWI, Tamar. "Nominal Clauses in the Dead Sea Scrolls: Corrigenda." *JJS* 60/1 (2009) 137.
- ZIAS, Joe. "A Scroll in One Hand and a Mattock in the Other: A Response." *RevQ* 23/4 (2008) 563–567.
- ZIEMER, Benjamin. "Der Orientreisende Abram des *Genesis-Apokryhon* im literarischen Grenzbereich." In *In Orient als Grenzbereich? Rabbinisches und außerrabbinisches Judentum*, ed. Annelies Kuyt and Gerold Necker, 11–35. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2007.
- ZIMMERMANN, Ruben. "The Love Triangle of Lady Wisdom: Sacred Marriage in Jewish Wisdom Literature?" In *Sacred Marriages: The Divine-Human Sexual Metaphor from Sumer to Early Christianity*, ed. Martti Nissinen and Risto Uro, 243–258. Winona Lake: Eisenbrauns, 2008.
- ZISSU, Boaz, and David AMIT. "Common Judaism, Common Purity, and the Second Temple Period Judean *Miqwa'ot* (Ritual Immersion Baths)." In *Common Judaism: Explorations in Second-Temple Judaism*, ed. Wayne O. McCready and Adele Reinhartz, 47–62. Minneapolis: Fortress, 2008.
- ZISSU, Boaz, and Amir GANOR. "Horvat 'Ethri: A Jewish Village from the Second Temple Period and the Bar Kokhba Revolt in the Judean Foot-hills." *JJS* 60/1 (2009) 90–136.
- ZSENGELLÉR, József. "Changes in the Balaam-Interpretation in the Hellenistic Jewish Literature (LXX, Philon, Pseudo-Philon and Josephus)." In *Biblical Figures in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, ed. Hermann Lichtenberger and Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, 487–508. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2008. Berlin: de Gruyter, 2009.
- ZSENGELLÉR, József. "Origin or Originality of the Torah: Historical and Textcritical Value of the Samaritan Pentateuch." In *From Qumran to Aleppo: A Discussion with Emanuel Tov about the Textual History of Jewish Scriptures in Honor of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Armin Lange, Matthias Weigold and József Zsengellér, 189–202. FRLANT 230. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2009.